REPORT 2

FROM THE

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

ON

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES;

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

APPENDIX AND INDEX.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed*,
4 *August* 1902.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, E.C.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE, EAST HARDING STREET, FLEET STREET, E.C., and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or
OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH; or
E. PONSONBY, 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1902

325.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE - - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii

REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. v

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE - - - - - - - - - p. vii

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 1

APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 127

INDEX - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 149

Digitized with financial assistance from

Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj

on 24 February, 2020

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

[*Monday, 24th February* 1902]:—*Resolved,* "That it is expedient that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the Standing Orders relating to houses occupied by persons of the labouring class and the Clauses usually inserted in Private and Local Bills and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills in pursuance thereof; and to report whether any amendments should be made in such Standing Orders and Clauses, and especially whether any and what provision should be made for better securing the re-housing of all persons of the labouring class who may be displaced in connection with the undertakings to which the Bills relate, whether displaced under the powers given by the Bills, or otherwise."

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

[*Monday, 3rd March* 1902]:—Message from the Lords,—That they concur with this House in their Resolution, "That it is expedient that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the Standing Orders relating to houses occupied by persons of the labouring class and the Clauses usually inserted in Private and Local Bills and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills in pursuance thereof; and to report whether any amendments should be made in such Standing Orders and Clauses, and especially whether any and what provision should be made for better securing the re-housing of all persons of the labouring class who may be displaced in connection with the undertakings to which the Bills relate, whether displaced under the powers given by the Bills, or otherwise."

[*Monday, 17th March* 1902]:—Lords Message (3rd March) relating to the appointment of a Joint Committee on the Housing of the Working Classes, read, and considered:—

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Seven Members be appointed to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords to consider the Standing Orders relating to houses occupied by persons of the labouring class and the Clauses usually inserted in Private and Local Bills and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills in pursuance thereof; and to report whether any amendments should be made in such Standing Orders and Clauses, and especially whether any and what provision should be made for better securing the re-housing of all persons of the labouring class who may be displaced in connection with the undertakings to which the Bills relate, whether displaced under the powers given by the Bills, or otherwise.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum of the Committee.

[*Thursday, 20th March* 1902]:—The Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords on Housing of the Working Classes was nominated of.—Mr. Bond, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Crean, Mr. Claude Hay, Mr. Kearley, Dr. Macnamara, and Sir John Tuke.

[*Friday, 18th April* 1902]:—Message from the Lords,—That they have appointed a Committee consisting of Seven Lords to join with the Committee appointed by this House, pursuant to Message of this House, "to consider the Standing Orders relating to houses occupied by persons of the labouring class and the Clauses usually inserted in Private and Local Bills and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills in pursuance thereof; and to report whether any amendments should be made in such Standing Orders and Clauses, and especially whether any and what provision should be made for better securing the re-housing of all persons of the labouring class who may be displaced in connection with the undertakings to which the Bills relate, whether displaced under the powers given by the Bills, or otherwise"; and that they do propose that the said Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room B, on Friday the 2nd of May next, at Three o'clock.

Lords Message *considered*:—

Ordered, That the Committee of this House do meet the Lords Committee as proposed by their Lordships.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

The following Members of the House of Lords were appointed to the Committee:—Earl of Camperdown, Earl Carrington, Viscount Hampden, Lord Hatherton, Lord Wenlock, Lord Sandhurst, Lord Lamington.

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to join with a COMMITTEE of the HOUSE OF LORDS to consider the Standing Orders relating to houses occupied by persons of the labouring class, and the clauses usually inserted in Private and Local Bills and Provisonal Order Confirmation Bills in pursuance thereof, and to report whether any Amendments should be made in such Standing Orders and clauses:——HAVE considered the matters to them referred, and have agreed to the following REPORT:—

1. WE submit two model clauses and three corresponding Standing Orders, which we recommend in place of the present model clauses and Standing Orders 38 and 111 [H.L.], 38 and 183A [H.C.], dealing with London and all places outside London, respectively.

2. We suggest that the model clauses be embodied in a Public General Act of Parliament.

3. After hearing evidence and consulting the Officials of the Home Office and Local Government Board, we have come to the conclusion that, in London, it is desirable that every case in which houses of the labouring class are proposed to be taken should be notified to the Central Authority, while, outside London, it is sufficient that the attention of the Central Authority should be called to cases in which thirty persons belonging to the labouring class are displaced in one Borough Urban District or Rural Parish, as the case may be.

4. In settling schemes for providing new houses in place of those demolished, we think it advisable that the Central Authority should exercise a full discretion.

5. We recommend that the new houses to be provided be suitable for persons of the labouring class and not too ambitious in character and design; we attach much importance to these conditions.

6. It will be observed that the area within which the new houses may be provided under a scheme is left by us wholly to the discretion of the Central Authority. It may be, and, we think, will be found expedient in some cases to erect the new houses at some considerable distance from the houses demolished, and not necessarily within the jurisdiction of the same local authority.

7. We recommend that in London the Central Authority be empowered to fix all rents for the new houses.

On this point we are not agreed. The above decision was arrived at on a division by six votes to three.

8. In regard to Ireland and Scotland, we were informed that neither the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland nor the Secretary for Scotland desired to make any suggestions to us.

So far as we can judge, our recommendations for places outside London are, with the necessary alterations, suitable for Ireland and Scotland.

LORDS AND MEMBERS PRESENT, AND MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AT EACH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE.

Friday, 2nd May 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of Camperdown.	Mr. Bond.
Earl Carrington.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Lord Hatherton.	Mr. Claude Hay.
Lord Wenlock.	Dr. Macnamara.
Lord Lamington.	

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 9th May 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Lord Hatherton.	Sir John Tuke.
Lord Lamington.	Dr. Macnamara.
Lord Sandhurst.	Mr. Kearley.
Viscount Hampden.	Mr. Bond.
	Mr. Crean.
	Mr. Claude Hay.

Mr. *C. E. Troup* was examined

[Adjourned till Wednesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, 14th May 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl Carrington.	Sir John Tuke
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Bond.
Lord Lamington.	Dr. Macnamara.
Viscount Hampden.	Mr. Crean
	Mr. Kearley.
	Mr. Jesse Collings.
	Mr. Claude Hay.

Mr. *C. E. Troup* was further examined.

Mr. *W. P. Byrne* and Mr. *H. T. Steward* were examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday, 28th May, at Twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, 28th May 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl Carrington.	Mr. Crean.
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Lord Hatherton.	Mr. Bond.
Viscount Hampden.	Sir John Tuke.
	Dr. Macnamara.

Mr. *Noel T. Kershaw* was examined; Mr. *W. P. Byrne* was recalled, and further examined.

[Adjourned till Friday, 6th June, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 6th June 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl Carrington.	Mr. Bond.
Earl of Aberdeen.	Dr. Macnamara.
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Crean.
Lord Hatherton.	Mr. Claude Hay.

Mr. *A. Gray* and Mr. *H. M. Robinson* were examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 10th June 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl of Aberdeen.	Dr. Macnamara.
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Claude Hay.
Lord Hatherton.	Mr. Jesse Collings.

Mr. *Lyulph Stanley*, Dr. *W. J. Collins*, and Mr. *J. S. Beale* were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 16th June 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl Carrington.	Mr. Claude Hay.
Earl of Aberdeen.	Mr. Bond.
Viscount Hampden.	
Lord Hatherton.	

The Lord Provost of *Glasgow*, Mr. *E. J. Harper*, Mr. *James Walsh*, and Mr. *Edwin Laverach* were examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday, 3rd July, at Half-past Two o'clock.

Thursday, 3rd July 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl Carrington.	Mr. Bond.
Earl of Aberdeen.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Kearley.
Lord Hatherton.	Sir John Tuke.
Lord Lamington.	Dr. Macnamara.
	Mr. Claude Hay.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Tuesday, 15th July, at Eleven o'clock.

Tuesday, 15th July 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Earl Carrington.	Mr. Claude Hay.
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Bond.
Lord Hatherton.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. Kearley.
Viscount Hampden.	Sir John Tuke.
	Dr. Macnamara.

The Committee deliberated.

DRAFT MODEL CLAUSE for LONDON proposed by the *Chairman*, read the first time, as follows:—

DRAFT CLAUSE FOR LONDON.

WHEREAS the acquisition of land by the company* under the powers of this or any subsequent Act or otherwise may occasion the displacement of persons of the labouring class, it is hereby enacted that, subject to the provisions of this section, it shall be the duty of the company to provide new dwellings suitable for persons of the labouring class not exceeding the number of such persons who have been displaced in view of, or may be displaced in consequence of, any acquisition of land by the company, and for the fulfilment of such duty (in this section referred to as a housing obligation) the following provisions shall have effect:—

(1.) In every case where the company acquire in the administrative county of London any lands on which any persons of the labouring class are residing, or within the last preceding five years have resided, the company shall, within one month after such acquisition, send to the Secretary of State a memorandum containing (*a*) a description of the respective lands and their situation; (*b*) a statement (accompanied by a plan) showing the number of houses (if any) with their respective postal addresses, on such lands occupied partially or wholly as tenants or lodgers by persons of the labouring class at the date of acquisition, and the number of persons of the labouring class, occupying those houses at that date; and (*c*) any particulars they may be able to ascertain as to the numbers of persons of the labouring class occupying houses on the lands during the five years previous to acquisition, and who have been displaced in view of such acquisition.

The company shall at the same time send a copy of the memorandum to the London County Council, and a copy of so much thereof as relates to the district of any local authority in that county, to that local authority.

(2.) The Secretary of State shall, after such inquiry as he may think necessary, determine the number of persons (if any) in respect of whom he is of opinion, having regard to the other provisions of this section, that a housing obligation has arisen, and shall enter the same in a register, together with particulars of the number of houses occupied by such persons, their description and situation, and such other particulars as he may think proper.

(3.) As soon as possible after the register has been filled up as aforesaid on the occasion of any acquisition of land by the company, the Secretary of State shall either give to the company a certificate to the effect that provision of new dwellings under this section is not required, or is not

* In the case of Local Authorities' Bills, substitute "Council," or as the case may be.

for the time being necessary, or shall require the company to prepare, for the approval of the Secretary of State, a scheme for the provision of new dwellings suitable for such number of persons of the labouring class as the Secretary of State shall require, but not exceeding the number entered in the register for whom the company have not already provided such dwellings.

(4.) In giving any such certificate, and in determining the number of persons in respect of whom a housing obligation has arisen under this section, the Secretary of State may have regard to any of the following considerations:—

(*a*) To what extent, if at all, accommodation of a suitable kind for persons of the labouring class in the neighbourhood of the land acquired is or will be insufficient after the displacement.

(*b*) Whether the number of persons entered in the register as occupying any houses described therein is greater than the number permitted by law in the district in which the houses are situate.

(*c*) To what extent, if at all, the company has given, or is prepared to give, financial assistance to any schemes or arrangements of the London County Council or any local authority or other persons for the provision of labouring class dwellings, or for the transference of industries and the persons of the labouring class dependent thereon to more suitable localities.

(5.) With respect to schemes under this section (*a*) the time within which a scheme is to be carried out shall be fixed therein; (*b*) the Secretary of State may direct provisions to be inserted in any scheme requiring the new dwellings to be completed fit for occupation before the persons in respect of whom the scheme is made are displaced, and prescribing the rents to be charged, and (*c*) the Secretary of State may, if he thinks fit, attach to his approval of any scheme, any conditions not being conditions in excess of the conditions imposed by the London Building Act (1894), or any other Act or Acts, bye-law or bye-laws, relating to buildings in the County of London, and also may require the company to give security for the carrying the scheme into effect.

(6.) Before giving any certificate or approving any scheme under this section, the Secretary of State shall cause a copy of the draft certificate or scheme to be sent to the London County Council, and to each local authority appearing to him to be concerned therein, and shall consider any representations which the county council or any such local authorities may, within a period to be prescribed by the Secretary of State make to him with regard to the draft certificate or scheme.

(7.) Any provisions of any scheme under this section shall be enforceable by a writ of Mandamus to be obtained by the Secretary of State out of the High Court.

(8.) If the company fail to furnish to the Secretary of State the memorandum required by this section with respect to any land acquired by them, they shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred pounds.

If the company, without having obtained a certificate from the Secretary of State or his approval of a scheme, or in contravention of any provisions of any scheme, displace any persons of the labouring class from any house, or use for the purposes of their undertaking any land in respect of which a housing obligation has arisen, they shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred pounds in respect of every such house.

Such penalties shall be recoverable by the Secretary of State by action in the High Court, and shall be applied by him in such manner as he may think fit, to defray the expenses of carrying out the provisions of this section, or to promote the provision of labouring class dwellings in or near London.

(9.) The company may for the purpose of carrying out any scheme under this section appropriate any lands for the time being belonging to them, or which they have power to acquire [*and may purchase such further lands as they may require].

(10.) The company may on any such lands erect dwellings for persons of the labouring class in accordance with the scheme, and may sell, demise, or let, or otherwise dispose of such dwellings and any lands purchased or acquired as aforesaid [†and may apply for the purposes of this section to which capital is properly applicable or any of such purposes any moneys which they may be authorised to raise or apply for the general purposes of their undertaking].

Provided that all lands on which any buildings have been erected by the company in pursuance of the scheme shall, for a period of twenty-five years from the date of such scheme, be appropriated for the purpose of such dwellings, and every conveyance, demise, or lease of such lands and buildings shall be endorsed with notice of this enactment:

Provided also that the Secretary of State may at any time dispense with all or any of the requirements of the foregoing proviso, subject to such conditions (if any) as he may see fit.

(11.) All buildings erected or provided by the company in the administrative county of London for the purpose of any scheme under this section shall be subject to the provisions of the London Building Act, 1894 (Local), and any other Act or Acts relating to buildings in that county.

(12.) The Secretary of State may direct any inquiries to be held by any persons appointed by him as inspectors which he may deem necessary in relation to any scheme under this section, or to

* In Local Authority's Bill, substitute for words in brackets, "and are authorised to appropriate for such purpose."
† Omit words in brackets in Local Authority's Bill.

the carrying out thereof, and may appoint or employ inspectors for the purposes of any inquiry, and the inspectors so appointed or employed shall, for the purposes of any such inquiry, have all such powers as the inspectors of the Local Government Board have for the purposes of inquiries directed by the Local Government Board under the Public Health Act, 1875.

(13.) The company shall pay to the Secretary of State any expenses incurred by him in relation to any inquiries under this section, including the expenses of any witnesses summoned by the inspector, and a reasonable sum to be fixed by the Secretary of State for the services of such inspector. The approval of the Secretary of State to any scheme may be given either absolutely or conditionally, and after the Secretary of State has approved of any such scheme he may from time to time approve either absolutely or conditionally of any modifications in the scheme.

(14.) For the purposes of this section—

The expression "house" means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling;

The expression "labouring class" means mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons other than domestic servants, whose income does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week, and the families of any such persons who may be residing with them;

The expression "local authority" means in the case of the city the common council, and elsewhere, the council of any metropolitan borough.

Question, "That the Draft Model Clause for London, proposed by the Chairman, be read a second ime, paragraph by paragraph,"—put, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 1:

Amendment proposed, in line 4, after the word "suitable" to insert the words "as to character and rental"—(Dr. *Macnamara*).—Question, "That those words be there inserted."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 5.	Noes, 6.
Earl Carrington.	Mr. Bond.
Mr. Kearley.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Mr. Claude Hay.	Viscount Hampden.
Dr. Macnamara.	Lord Wenlock.
Sir John Tuke.	Lord Lamington.
	Earl of Camperdown.

An Amendment made.

Paragraph 1, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 2, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 3, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 4:

Amendment proposed, in line 3, to leave out the word "may" in order to insert the word "shall"—(Lord *Wenlock*)—instead thereof.—Question put, "That the word 'may' stand part of the paragraph."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 6.	Noes, 5.
Mr. Claude Hay.	Lord Wenlock.
Mr. Kearley.	Lord Lamington.
Dr. Macnamara.	Mr. Bond.
Sir John Tuke.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Earl Carrington.	Earl of Camperdown.
Viscount Hampden.	

Another Amendment proposed to leave out Sub-section (*b*)—(Viscount *Hampden*).—Question, "That Sub-section (*b*) stand part of the paragraph."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 6.	Noes, 5.
Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Claude Hay.
Lord Lamington.	Earl Carrington.
Mr. Bond.	Viscount Hampden.
Mr. Jesse Collings.	Mr. Kearley.
Sir John Tuke.	Dr. Macnamara.
Earl of Camperdown.	

Amendments made.

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 5, considered.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Half-past Two o'clock.

Thursday, 17*th July* 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Viscount Hampden.	Sir John Tuke.
Earl Carrington.	Mr. Bond.
	Mr. Jesse Collings.
	Mr. Claude Hay.
	Mr. Kearley.
	Dr. Macnamara.

Draft Model Clause for London further considered.

Paragraph 5 further considered.

Amendment proposed, in line 6, to leave out the words "and prescribing the rents to be charged to the persons displaced"—(Mr. *Bond*).—Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 7.	Noes, 2.
Mr. Jesse Collings.	Mr. Bond.
Mr. Claude Hay.	Viscount Hampden.
Earl Carrington.	
Mr. Kearley.	
Sir John Tuke.	
Dr. Macnamara.	
Earl of Camperdown.	

Another Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "to the persons displaced," in lines 6 and 7.—Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 3.	Noes, 6.
Mr. Bond.	Earl Carrington.
Mr. Jesse Collings.	Viscount Hampden.
Earl of Camperdown.	Mr. Claude Hay.
	Mr. Kearley.
	Sir John Tuke.
	Dr. Macnamara.

[Adjourned till To-morrow, at Two o'clock.

Friday, 18*th July* 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Bond.
Lord Hatherton.	Sir John Tuke.
Lord Lamington.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Viscount Hampden.	Mr. Kearley.

Draft Model Clause for London further considered.

Paragraph 5 further considered.

An Amendment made.

Another Amendment proposed, to insert after the word "scheme," in line 8, the words "any conditions not being conditions in excess of the conditions imposed by the London Building Act (1894) or any other Act or Acts, bye-law or bye-laws relating to buildings in the County of London—(Mr. *Bond*).—Question, "That those words be there inserted,"—put, and *agreed to*.

Another Amendment made.

Paragraph 5, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 6, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 7, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 8, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 9—13, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 14, amended, and *agreed to.*

Another Amendment proposed, that the following new paragraph be inserted in the proposed Model Clause: "The approval of the Secretary of State to any scheme may be given either absolutely or conditionally, and after the Secretary of State has approved of any such scheme he may from time to time approve either absolutely or conditionally of any modifications in the scheme"—(Mr. *Jesse Collings*).—Question, "That the proposed new paragraph be there inserted,"—put, and *agreed to.*

Draft Model Clause for London, as amended, *agreed to.*

CLAUSE for all places outside London (to be modified for Scotland and Ireland and for Local Authorities) read the first time, as follows:—

LABOURING CLASS HOUSES.

Restrictions as to houses of labouring class.

(1.) The company shall not under the powers of this Act [or of any former Act the powers of which are revived or extended by this Act] enter into possession, in any borough or other urban district, and elsewhere than in any borough or urban district, in any parish, of any houses which on the fifteenth day of December last were, or have been at any time since that day, or shall hereafter be occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring class, whether as tenants or lodgers, to a total number of thirty or more persons, unless and until—

(*a*) They shall have obtained the approval of the Local Government Board to a scheme for providing new dwellings for such number of persons of the labouring class as the Local Government Board shall determine, not exceeding the number residing in such houses on the said fifteenth day of December or at any subsequent time; and

(*b*) They shall, if required by the Local Government Board, have given security for the carrying out of the scheme.

(2.) In determining the number of persons for whom new dwellings are to be provided, the Local Government Board may take into account the number of persons of the labouring class who at any time during five years preceding resided in the houses or in houses already demolished, and were displaced in view of the acquisition of the land by the company.

(3.) In approving any scheme the Local Government Board may have regard to any of the following considerations:—

(*a.*) To what extent, if at all, accommodation of a suitable kind for persons of the labouring class in the neighbourhood of the land acquired is or will be insufficient after the displacement.

(*b.*) Whether the number of persons occupying any of the said houses is greater than the number permitted by law in the district in which the houses are situate.

(*c.*) To what extent, if at all, the company has given financial assistance to any schemes or arrangements of any local authority or other persons for the provision of labouring class dwellings, or for the transference of industries and the persons of the labouring class dependent thereon to more suitable localities.

(4.) With respect to schemes under this section (*a*) the time within which a scheme is to be carried out shall be fixed therein; (*b*) the Local Government Board may direct provisions to be inserted in any scheme requiring the new dwellings to be completed fit for occupation before the persons in respect of whom the scheme is made are displaced; and (*c*) the Local Government Board may, if they think fit, attach any conditions to their approval of any scheme, and may require the company to give security for the carrying the scheme into effect, and after approving any such scheme the Local Government Board may from time to time approve, either absolutely or conditionally, of any modification in the scheme.

(5.) If the company demolish position of any house or displace or cause to be displaced any persons residing in any house in contravention of this section or of any scheme under this section, they shall be liable to a penalty of five hundred pounds in respect of every such house, which penalty shall be recoverable by the Local Government Board by action in the High Court, and shall be carried to and form part of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom:

Provided that the Court may if it think fit reduce such penalty.

(6.) For the purpose of carrying out any scheme under this section the company may appropriate any lands for the time being belonging to them, or which they have power to acquire, and may purchase such further lands as they may require, and for the purpose of any such purchase sections 176 and 297 of the Public Health Act, 1875, shall be incorporated with this Act, and shall apply to the purchase of lands by the company for the purposes of the scheme in the same manner in all respects as if the company were a local authority within the meaning of the Public Health Act, 1875, and the scheme were one of the purposes of that Act.

(7.) The company may on any lands belonging to them, or purchased or acquired under this section or any Provisional Order made in pursuance of this section, erect such dwellings for persons of the labouring class as may be prescribed by the scheme, and may sell, demise, or let, or otherwise dispose of such dwellings, and any lands purchased or acquired as aforesaid, and may apply for the purposes of this section to which capital is properly applicable, or any of such purposes, any moneys which they may be authorised to raise or apply for the general purposes of their undertaking:

Provided that all lands on which any buildings have been erected or provided by the company in pursuance of the scheme shall for a period of twenty-five years from the date of the scheme be appropriated for the purpose of dwellings for persons of the labouring class, and every conveyance, demise, or lease of such lands and buildings shall be endorsed with notice of this enactment.

(Inserted in Railway Bill only.)

*(8.) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in section 157 of the Public Health Act, 1875, the provisions of that section and of sections 155 and 156 of the same Act shall apply to buildings erected or provided by the company for the purpose of any scheme under this section.

(9.) The Local Government Board may direct any inquiries to be held which they may deem necessary in relation to the purposes of this section, and for giving effect to any of the provisions of this section, and the inspectors of the Local Government Board shall for the purposes of any such inquiry have all such powers as they have for the purposes of inquiries directed by that Board under the Public Health Act, 1875.

(10.) The company shall pay to the Local Government Board a sum to be fixed by that Board in respect of the preparation and issue of any Provisional Order in pursuance of this section, and any expenses incurred by that Board in relation to any inquiries under this section, including the expenses of any witnesses summoned by the inspector, and a sum to be fixed by that Board not exceeding three guineas a day for the services of such inspector.

(11.) Any provisions of any scheme under this section, or any conditions subject to which the Local Government Board may have approved of any scheme or of any modifications of any scheme, or subject to which they may have dispensed with any of the requirements of this section, shall be enforceable by a writ of mandamus to be obtained by the Local Government Board out of the High Court.

(12.) For the purposes of this section the expression "labouring class" includes mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons other than domestic servants, whose income does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week, and the families of any of such persons who may be residing with them.

Question, "That the Clause be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph,"—put, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 1, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 2—4, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 5, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 6—12, *agreed to.*

Draft Model Clause for all places outside London, as amended, *agreed to.*

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, at Two o'clock.

Tuesday, 22nd July 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Lord Wenlock.	Mr. Bond.
Viscount Hampden.	Dr. Macnamara.
Earl of Aberdeen.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Earl Carrington.	Mr. Claude Hay.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the following Standing Orders be substituted for Standing Orders Nos. 38 and 111 of the House of Lords and Nos. 38 and 183*a* of the House of Commons."

LABOURING CLASS HOUSES.

Proposed Amendments of Standing Orders.

Deposit of statement relating to houses inhabited by the labouring class.

38. Where any Blll contains or revives or extends power to take compulsorily or by agreement or to appropriate any land in any local area as defined for the purposes of this Order, and such taking or appropriation involves or may involve the taking or appropriating in London of any houses in which persons belonging to the labouring class are residing, or in any other local area any houses in which thirty or more such persons are residing, the promoters shall deposit in the office of the Clerk of Parliaments and at the office of the Central Authority, and at the office of the Local Authority on or before the 17th December, a statement of the number, description, postal address, and situation of all such houses, and the number (so far as can be ascertained) of such persons residing therein, and also a copy of so much of the plan (if any) as relates thereto.

For the purposes of this Order—

The expression "local area" means—

(1) the administrative County of London;

(2) as respects England and Wales (outside London) any borough, or other urban district; and elsewhere than in a borough or other urban district, any parish;

(3) as respects Scotland, any district within the meaning of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; and

(4) as respects Ireland, any urban district.

The expression "local authority" means—

(*a*) in the case of the City of London the common council, and elsewhere in London the council of any metropolitan borough;

(*b*) as to England and Wales (outside London) in any borough the town council, and in any district, the district council whether urban or rural;

(*c*) as regards Scotland, the council of any district as aforesaid;

(*d*) as regards Ireland, in any urban district, the district council.

The expression "labouring class" means mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons, other than domestic servants, whose income does not exceed an average of thirty shillings a week, and the families of any of such persons who may be residing with them;

The expression "Central Authority" means as regards London the Secretary of State for the Home Department, as regards England and Wales (outside London) the Local Government Board, as regards Scotland the Secretary for Scotland, and as regards Ireland the Local Government Board for Ireland.

The expression "Bill" includes a Provisional Order Confirmation Bill.

Provisions with respect to houses occupied by labouring class. (Provinces).

111. In the case of every Bill which gives, revives, or extends power to take land compulsorily or by agreement, or to appropriate land, elsewhere than in London, clauses shall be inserted—

(1.) Providing that the promoters shall not in the exercise of such power purchase, acquire, or appropriate in any local area any houses in which persons belonging to the labouring class are residing, to the number of thirty or more unless and until

(*a*) They shall have obtained the approval of the Central Authority to a scheme for providing new dwellings for such number of persons of the labouring class as the Central Authority shall after inquiry determine (not exceeding the number of such persons residing in the said houses) having regard to the amount of vacant suitable accommodation in the neighbourhood of the houses, and to the places of employment of such persons and all the other circumstances of the case;

(*b*) They shall, if so required by the Central Authority, have given security for the carrying out of the scheme;

(2.) Imposing adequate penalties on the promoters in the event of any contravention of the provisions of the clauses or of the scheme.

(3.) Providing that the expenses, or any part of the expenses, incurred by the Central Authority under the clauses shall be defrayed by the promoters of the Bill; and

(4.) Conferring on the promoters and on the Central Authority respectively any powers that may be necessary to give full effect to the scheme.

Expressions defined in Order 38, except so far as they relate to London, have the same meanings in this Order.

Provisions with respect to labouring class houses in London.

111A. Where the acquisition of land in London under the powers of any Bill may occasion the displacement of persons of the labouring class, clauses extending to all subsequent acquisitions of land by the promoters shall be inserted in the Bill—

(*a.*) Imposing upon the promoters the obligation of providing new dwellings suitable for such number of persons of the labouring class as the Secretary of State may determine, not exceeding the number of such persons who may have been displaced in view of, or may be displaced in consequence of, any acquisitions of land by the promoters.

(*b.*) Authorising the Secretary of State, having regard to the amount of vacant suitable accommodation in the neighbourhood, the number of persons displaced and the other circumstances of the case, to relieve the promoters wholly or partially or temporarily from the said obligation.

(*c.*) Authorising the Secretary of State, in determining the number of persons for whom new dwellings are to be provided, to take into account the number of persons of the labouring class who within the five years preceding have been displaced in view of each acquisition of the land by the promoters.

(*d.*) Authorising the Secretary of State, if he thinks fit, to prescribe the rents to be charged to the tenants of the new dwellings.

(*e.*) Requiring the promoters to provide the new dwellings in accordance with a scheme to be approved by the Secretary of State.

(*f.*) Imposing adequate penalties on the promoters in the event of any contravention of the provisions of the clauses or of the scheme.

(*g.*) Providing that the expenses, or any part of the expenses, incurred by the Secretary of State under the clauses shall be defrayed by the promoters of the Bill; and

(*h.*) Conferring on the promoters, and on the Secretary of State, respectively, any powers that may be necessary to give full effect to the scheme.

Expressions defined in Order 38, so far as they relate to London, have the same meanings in this Order.

New Standing Orders considered, amended, and *agreed to.*

[Adjourned till Thursday, the 31st of July, at Half-past Two o'clock.

Thursday, 31st July 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN in the Chair.

Lord Lamington.	Mr. Bond.
Earl Carrington.	Mr. Claude Hay.
Lord Hatherton.	Mr. Jesse Collings.

DRAFT REPORT proposed by the *Chairman*, read the first time, as follows:

YOUR Committee have held 13 sittings and examined 13 witnesses, and beg to make the following REPORT:—

"1. We submit two model clauses and three corresponding Standing Orders, which we recommend in place of the present model clauses and Standing Orders 38 and 111 [H.L.], 38 and 183A [H.C.], dealing with London and all places outside London respectively.

"2. We suggest that the model clauses, when finally settled, be embodied in a Public General Act of Parliament.

"3. After hearing evidence and consulting the officials of the Home Office and Local Government Board, we have come to the conclusion that, in London, it is desirable that every case in which houses of the labouring class are proposed to be taken should be notified to the Central Authority, while, outside London, it is sufficient that the attention of the Central Authority should be called to cases in which 30 persons belonging to the labouring class are displaced in one Borough Urban District or Rural Parish, as the case may be.

"4. In settling schemes for providing new houses in place of those demolished, we think it advisable that the Central Authority should exercise a full discretion.

"It was suggested to us that Corporations, School Boards and other Local Authorities ought not to be subject to the same Standing Order as companies trading for gain, or that at all events it might be indicated by us that such Public Authorities deserve more favourable treatment in regard to rehousing schemes. We do not, however, propose to make any suggestion to the Central Authority, believing that a full statement of this, as well as of other circumstances of the case, can and will be laid before the Central Authority when the scheme is under consideration.

"5. We recommend that the new houses to be provided be suitable for persons of the labouring class and not too ambitious in character and design; we attach much importance to these conditions.

"6. It will be observed that the area within which the new houses may be provided under a scheme is left by us wholly to the discretion of the Central Authority. It may be, and, we think, will be found expedient in some cases to erect the new houses at some considerable distance from the houses demolished, and not necessarily within the jurisdiction of the same Local Authority.

"7. We recommend that in London the Central Authority be empowered to fix all rents for the new houses.

"On this point we are not agreed. The above decision was arrived at on a division by six votes to three.

"8. In regard to Ireland and Scotland, we were informed that neither the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland nor the Secretary for Scotland desired to make any suggestions to us.

"So far as we can judge, our recommendations for places outside London are, with the necessary alterations, suitable for Ireland and Scotland."

Question, "That the Draft Report proposed by the Chairman be read a second time paragraph by paragraph,"—put, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 1, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 2:

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "be embodied in"—(Mr. *Jesse Collings*).—Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 4.	Noes, 3.
Mr. Claude Hay.	Mr. Bond.
Earl Carrington.	Mr. Jesse Collings.
Lord Hatherton.	Lord Lamington.
Earl of Camperdown.	

Paragraph *agreed to.*

Paragraph 3, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 4:

Amendment proposed, to leave out all the words from "discretion" in line 2 to the end of the paragraph—(Mr. *Bond*).—Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph,"—put, and *negatived.*

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 5—8, *agreed to.*

Question, That this Report, as amended, be the Report of the Committee.

Ordered, to Report.

Ordered, That Mr. *Jesse Collings* be instructed to make this Report to the House of Commons.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

PAGE

Die Veneris, 9° *Maii* 1902.

Mr. C. E. Troup, C.B. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 3

Die Mercurii, 14° *Maii* 1902.

Mr. W. P. Byrne and Mr. H. T. Steward - - - - - - - - - - - 19

Die Mercurii, 28° *Maii* 1902.

Mr. C. E. Troup, C.B. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 43

Mr. Noel T. Kershaw - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 45

Mr. W. P Byrne - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 61

Die Veneris, 6° *Junii* 1902.

Mr. A. Gray - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 65

Mr. Hugh Mansfield Robinson, LL.D. (London) - - - - - - - - - - 70

Die Martis, 10° *Junii* 1902.

The Hon. Edward Lyulph Stanley - - - - - - - - - - - - - 85

Dr. William Job Collins, D.L., J.P. - - - - - - - - - - - - 98

Mr. James Samuel Beale - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 103

Die Lunæ, 16° *Junii* 1902.

Mr. Samuel Chisholm, LL.D. (Lord Provost of Glasgow) - - - - - - - - 109

Mr. Edgar Josiah Harper - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 112

Mr. James Walsh - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 119

Mr. Edwin Laverack - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 122

Die Veneris, 9° *Maii*, 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN.	Mr. BOND.
Viscount HAMPDEN.	Mr. JESSE COLLINGS.
Lord HATHERTON.	Mr. CREAN.
Lord WENLOCK.	Mr. CLAUDE HAY.
Lord SANDHURST.	Mr. KEARLEY.
Lord LAMINGTON.	Dr. MACNAMARA.
	Sir JOHN TUKE.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN, IN THE CHAIR.

MR. C. E. TROUP, C.B., is called in; and Examined as follows:—

Chairman.

1. I BELIEVE that you have charge of the Parliamentary and Industrial Department of the Home Office?—Yes.

2. Will you tell us exactly what your duties are?—One of the duties of the Parliamentary Department is to watch private Bills going through Parliament which contain clauses affecting any matters within the Home Office jurisdiction, and among other matters we watch Bills promoted by railway companies, other companies, or local bodies which involve the taking of land in London.

3. In London alone?—Yes, only in London. Outside London the matter comes within the jurisdiction of the Local Government Board. When we find that a Bill contains clauses for the taking of land, we see that proper clauses are introduced on the subject of the housing of the working classes; we take steps to secure that these clauses contain the provisions required by the Standing Order of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and that otherwise the provision is adequate. That is the point to which the work of my Department goes in regard to the housing of the working classes. The administration of those clauses after they have passed into Acts belongs to another department, and other witnesses will speak as to that.

4. Then if you are not concerned with the administration of the Acts and another Department is, I suppose that you in making your recommendations and reports to the Home Secretary concert with them and ascertain from them the difficulties which arise in administration?—Yes. We are constantly in communication.

5. And really your function is that you draw up whatever regulations are necessary on the advice which you receive from them?—Yes.

6. Now let us turn to the Standing Orders. Would you just state to us very shortly the Standing Orders with special reference to those which apply at the present time? It is not necessary to go at any length into the Standing Orders which have been superseded?—The first

Chairman—continued.

Standing Order on the subject was passed by the House of Lords in 1853 on the motion of Lord Shaftesbury. That order merely required the promoters of Bills which sought power to take 30 houses to make a deposit showing the number and description of the houses, in the Parliamentary offices. That Order had very little effect, and it was not until 1874 that much more extensive Orders were adopted by the House of Commons, and in 1875 by the House of Lords. Those Orders required the deposit of the plans and of the statements as to the number of houses taken, with the Parliamentary offices. They required that when 15 or more houses were taken notice should be given eight weeks beforehand so as to give the working classes full notice of the intention to displace them; and then there was a provision that the promoters should insert clauses requiring them to procure sufficient accommodation for persons of the labouring classes to be displaced if those provisions were applicable; but it was left to the discretion of the Committee to say whether the provisions were applicable or not. It is not necessary to go into the history of those Orders because the Royal Commission of 1884 reported that they had failed to produce any effect in providing accommodation for the working classes. They had a certain effect, I think, in securing that a certain amount of compensation was given to the working people before they were turned out, and that some provision was made for their getting accommodation for the time being; but they did not, in fact, add anything to the permanent stock of accommodation for the working classes in place of what was removed by the companies. That was the finding of the Royal Commission of 1884. In this paper which I have handed in, the whole of the remarks of the Royal Commission on the Standing Orders are printed in full.

7. I think in 1884 both Houses adopted new Standing Orders?—Yes.

8. Based on the recommendation of the Royal Commission?—Yes, they were entirely due to

Chairman—continued.

the recommendation of the Royal Commission. The Royal Commission suggested the exact wording of the Standing Orders which were introduced.

9. Will you tell us briefly what those were—the changes that they made?—The most important change in those Standing Orders as compared with the earlier Standing Orders, was that they required the railway companies and other bodies, not merely to rehouse the persons whom they displaced, but to provide new accommodation in place of the accommodation they removed. It was not merely a question of providing for the particular people displaced, but, in the words of the Committee, they were to be "compelled to provide suitable accommodation in substitution for that which they were destroying"; that is to say, if a railway company took away a certain amount of working class accommodation from a district they were to provide an equivalent amount in its place. Then to secure this the Standing Orders required first that there should be a deposit with the Parliamentary offices and with the Home Office of a statement showing the number of houses which were to be taken under the Bill, and the number of persons of the working class who were to be displaced; and they directed the insertion in the Bill of clauses requiring that the company should submit to the Home Office a scheme for rehousing, and that before any displacement took place that scheme should have the approval of the Home Secretary. A certain discretion was allowed to the Home Secretary in reducing the number of persons to be rehoused according to the circumstances, "having regard to the number of persons residing in the houses to be taken and to the amount of suitable accommodation in the neighbourhood."

10. Of course, your evidence throughout will be limited to land which is taken in the Metropolis?—In the Metropolis—yes. Outside the Metropolis it was entirely a matter for the Local Government Board.

11. Did the Local Government Board have any voice in proposing the fresh Standing Order? Was it done entirely by Parliament, or was it done upon the recommendations which were made in the Home Office to the Home Secretary, and through him to Parliament?—In 1884 it was done on the direct representation of the Royal Commission.

12. And the House of Lords at the same time adopted Standing Orders identical with those of the House of Commons?—Yes, absolutely identical Orders, except one or two necessary variations.

13. Then just to carry the history through, will you tell us the changes which have been made since 1884, and the Standing Orders which are now in force?—Most of my evidence will turn on points relating to the changes which have been made since 1884. From time to time those Standing Orders have been altered, partly in consequence of alterations in the law, such as the alterations of the local authorities, and partly on suggestions made by the Home Office on points where we found that the Standing Orders left loopholes for escape.

Chairman—continued.

14. I should like your opinion upon that. Perhaps it might be most convenient that you should state to us the loopholes which you found which rendered further changes in the Standing Orders desirable. Would that be the most convenient, do you think?—I think I had better first mention the model clauses, because the two things go together.

15. Very well. Then pray do so?—I cannot give the exact date, but some time after the passing of the Standing Orders model clauses were settled to give effect to them. These model clauses were included in the "Model Bills and Clauses" of the House of Lords, which are revised every eSssion by Lord Morley.

Mr. *Bond.*

16. Settled by whom?—It is Lord Morley who settles the changes. There are two model clauses—one is a short form.

Chairman.

17. Do you know in what year the Lord Chairman first included these model clauses?—I do not know which year; Mr. Gray promised to look it up, and let me know. I will give the date later if it is wanted. There have been two forms—one is a short form, which is intended for cases where there is not proposed to be any dishousing; it is merely a formal compliance with the Standing Order prohibiting the companies from taking more than 20 houses.

18. Suppose they take 19—that is dishousing, is it not?—It is dishousing. I ought to have explained that the Standing Order in the case of London only requires a scheme for rehousing if 20 or more houses inhabited by the working classes are taken; so that a short form was adopted for cases where it was not proposed to take more than 20 houses, and then a longer form, which is printed on page 6 of the memorandum—

19. Before you leave that, let me ask you one question just to follow it out: Supposing that 19 houses were taken, was no remedy at all provided for those nineteen?—No. If not more than 19 houses were taken within one local area, then there was nothing done at all.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

20. What is a "local area"?—The "local area" originally was, any parish; it has now been extended. That is one of the alterations Lord Morley made in the form. It has now been extended to mean any Metropolitan borough.

Chairman.

21. Now, as regards the long model clause—what have you to say as to that?—The long model clause contains very full provisions for carrying out the requirements of the Standing Order. I do not think I need go through it in detail.

22. No; just mention the distinctive features of it?—The main point is that before the 20 or more houses are taken, the company "shall have obtained the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to a scheme for providing new dwellings for such number of persons as

Chairman—continued.

as were residing in such houses on the 15th day of December last, or for such number of persons as the Secretary of State shall, after inquiry, deem necessary, having regard" to various circumstances. Then, before they begin to dishouse, they must also give "security to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State for the carrying out of the scheme." Then there are further provisions empowering the Secretary of State to impose conditions and to prescribe the time within which the work is to be carried out. The scheme has to be carried out before any of the working classes are displaced under the Bill, except that the Secretary of State has the power to dispense with those requirements—a power he would naturally exercise in order to allow accommodation to be provided for part of the people to be displaced before the whole scheme was completed. Then the remaining provisions relate to the acquisition of land for the purpose of the rehousing, and require the buildings to be carried out in accordance with the local Acts and bye-laws, and provide for inquiries by the Secretary of State and for the expenses. Then there is sub-section 11, to which I will refer more fully afterwards, because that was a sub-section put in to meet gaps.

23. That is known as the five years clause, is it not?—That is the five years clause—a sort of retrospective clause. Then, at the end, there is a definition of the "labouring class," which was part of the original recommendation of the Commission of 1884, and which has never been altered since.

24. Also of "house"?—The definition of "house" I will refer to later. It was an addition.

25. Now, will you inform the Committee of the order in which you discovered defects in the working of those Standing Orders, which led to some of those changes which you have told us of in detail?—Yes. The first point that was noticed was this: The model clause required the same number of persons to be rehoused as were inhabiting the houses taken on the 15th day of December last past on the passing of the Act. It was found that certain of the railway companies made arrangements for taking the houses before the 15th day of December, and had the houses cleared of the working classes before that date, so that the houses did not come within the clause at all.

26. Might I ask how that was done exactly—was it by making arrangements with the landlord so that he should clear out the tenants, and then hand over the houses to them vacant?—Yes, it might be done by arrangement with the landlord. The company would tell him they were going to take the houses and probably he would get a better price for them if they could take them vacant; or, in other cases, the company might acquire the houses before the day themselves, and make the arrangements for getting rid of the tenants. This question arose first on a South-Eastern Bill of 1889.

Mr. *Bond.*

27. I think the model clause says that they shall not, under the powers of this Act, purchase

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

or acquire. Therefore, so far as those words are concerned, they would not be able to purchase in anticipation of the Act being passed?—No, that was a weak point in that Standing Order; it did not apply unless they came under the Act. Of course, in the cases referred to the companies, if they had acquired the land before, came afterwards for confirming power to Parliament—to confirm the purchase. This occurred first in the case of a South Eastern Bill of 1889. The point was taken up by the London County Council, and the London County Council opposed the Bill.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

28. Do you mean in Bermondsey—was that the case?—It was in Lambeth, the case I refer to. They opposed the Bill and secured the insertion of a clause making that Act retrospective. Perhaps I might read the clause, because it shows exactly what the circumstances were.

Chairman.

29. Do so, please?—"Whereas the company are authorised, under the powers of this Act, to acquire certain houses in the parish of St. Mary, Lambeth, which are numbered in the deposited plans and in the deposited books of reference 8 to 12 inclusive, and 16, 17, and 18 in that parish, and whereas in or about the month of September, 1887, the company took possession of eight houses then standing on the said sites and occupied by persons of the labouring class, and removed the occupants of and subsequently demolished the said houses, therefore, for the purposes of the preceding Section the said houses shall be deemed to have been acquired under the powers of this Act and to have been occupied on the 15th day of December last by the same number of persons belonging to the labouring class as were occupying the said houses at the date of their acquisition by the company."

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

30. That is an 1897 Act?—That is in their Act of 1889.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

31. Have you the name of that scheme?—It was in the South Eastern Railway Company's Bill.

Chairman.

32. That is the South Eastern?—Yes, the South Eastern. That was done on the motion of the London County Council.

33. Then you took no action?—We took no action that session.

34. Of course, you observed that?—We observed that, and as it showed a distinct weakness in the clause, the next session we reported on all the London Bills, suggesting the insertion of a general clause in the same sense as this clause. The London County Council also acted on the same lines, and opposed some of the Bills, and finally a form of clause was settled by Lord Morley, which was inserted in all the London Bills of 1890, and which has appeared in all Bills since.

35. That is Subsection (11) of the long model clause?—Yes; it is Subsection (11), but it has undergone some subsequent alterations; it has been made wider since that date.

36. Are

Mr. *Kearley.*

36. Are the alterations set forth in your memorandum?—I am going to mention some of the alterations presently.

Chairman.

37. You said you would make a statement with regard to that Subsection (11) at a later period?—Yes.

38. Will you do that now?—Well, it will come in, I think, as I mention the other points.

39. Do it your own way, please; because you know best?—The next point is another one which arose on the same clause. As it was settled in 1890 it applied to houses—houses acquired or purchased for the company—on lands shown on the deposited plans. Another way in which it could be evaded was by the companies purchasing not actual houses but sites from which the houses had been cleared away altogether before the company purchased them. That is a defect which still exists in the clause. That point is not covered. It ought, I think, to be covered by introducing the words "sites of houses," or some words to that effect—"any houses or sites of houses acquired by the company."

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

40. Where would that come?—In Subsection 11. I mention it now because it is so closely connected with the last point.

Mr. *Kearley.*

41. That does not include sites already cleared, does it?—No.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

42. A case in point there was the case of the London and North Western, was it not, buying and clearing a site?—The case in which that question has recently arisen is one in a Bill of this Session where the City and Great Northern Railway are proposing to take a site from which the houses have been cleared entirely.

43. What are the facts of that case?—In that case there was a group of 24 houses all inhabited by persons of the working classes.

44. How many of them?—I think about 150, but I cannot give the exact number. That site was taken by contractors who were carrying out certain works as I understand it for the City and Great Northern Railway, and now when the contractors have done with it, it is proposed by the Bill now before Parliament that it shall be taken over by the company.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

45. Do you know what period of time elapsed between the demolition and the taking over?—I cannot give the exact time, but it must be something like two or three years. It would certainly come within the five years mentioned in this Clause. Of course, I do not wish to say that the company in this case are trying to evade the statute; they say that it was taken in the ordinary course of business by their contractors, and the contractors having done with it, it happens to be a suitable site for their generating station.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

46. Do they say that their contractor would have taken those lands if he had not been contractor for that particular railway?—I cannot say anything as to that.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

47. Is it said that the demolition would have taken place in any case?—Yes; that they had no intention of taking the site at the time it was taken by their contractors.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

48. The Borough Council of Shoreditch deny that, do they not?—At all events, if this clause were extended not only to houses but to sites of houses which had been cleared it would cover a case like that—provided it could be shown that there were 24 houses inhabited by the working classes. In this particular case the allegation is made that they were insanitary houses which had already been condemned by the local authority before even they came into the hands of the contractors.

49. Is there any proof of that? I should like to pursue that point—it is rather an important one?—I have only the statement of the company which now proposes to take it.

50. It is the statement of the company?—It is the statement of the company. There is another very similar point which arose on this same clause.

Chairman.

51. A third difficulty?—Yes. A third difficulty which arose on this clause was that, as originally drafted, it applied to any houses shown on the deposited plans—that is, the plans deposited by the railway companies or other companies before they bring in their Bill to Parliament.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

52. Under what section of the clause is that?—That is still Sub-section (11), only it is a point in which the clause as originally drawn read: "Any house on any of the lands shown in the deposited plans." It was supposed, I think, when this clause was drafted, that it would cover everything done by the railway companies, because the railway companies were supposed to have no power to take or hold land except in pursuance of a special Act of Parliament. But that doctrine does not apply in all cases. It may be right as regards railway companies, but it certainly does not apply to limited companies—electric lighting companies or gas companies, which are incorporated under the Companies Acts. They have power under the Companies Acts to take and hold land, and therefore the clause may not cover all the cases in which they take land under statutory powers, in this way: Say, an electric lighting company might obtain power from Parliament to take a certain number of houses, and then, by going to the owners, might purchase some of them not under the statutory powers but without special powers.

Chairman.

53. But by agreement?—Just by ordinary agreement, and in that way might escape the requirement of the Order.

54. Then

Chairman—continued.

54. Then this third difficulty, of which you are speaking, is not a difficulty which could arise with a railway company, but with other companies?—The question arises first as regards other companies, but I think it also arises as regards railway companies. The question actually came up with regard to an electric lighting company. They were taking (say) 28 houses; we had no evidence to show that they meant to take part of them in any other way than under the Act; but still we were afraid that that might happen; we knew they were very anxious to get the houses without coming under the statute.

Mr. *Bond.*

55. I should like to be quite clear about this. I suppose we may take it as a fact that a railway company cannot privately acquire houses or lands except under statutory power?—That was the theory of the law on which the clause was originally adopted.

56. As a matter of fact, I think they very often do, do they not?—Yes, as a matter of fact they do.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

57. Was not the Broad Street dwelling house site a case in point?—Yes. I was just going to mention that next. In the case of the Broad Street dwellings site the railway company had agreed with a company which owned workmen's dwellings——

58. Then in liquidation, was it not?—It was subsequently in liquidation; I do not think it was in liquidation at the time the contract was made; they agreed to buy certain houses inhabited by persons of the working class without coming to Parliament in any way for powers.

59. They were actually model dwellings, were they not?—Yes, they were model dwellings.

Lord *Wenlock.*

60. Are you talking of the railway company?—Talking about the London and North Western—in fact, it is the case on which the London and North Western Bill was thrown out last Session.

Chairman.

61. I thought you were now in the year 1899?—I was rather interrupted.

62. That is by reason of a member of the Committee just taking you a little further on?—A little further on than I meant to go.

63. As I understood, you were at the case of the St. James's Electrical Lighting Bill of 1899, were you not?—Yes. In that case—coming back to that—we had some reason to think that possibly the company might acquire some of the houses, apart altogether from the statute, and we made a report on the Bill and pressed for the insertion of a clause to prevent this happening; and the company—the promoters of the Bill—finally agreed to insert such a clause in the Bill; and then at the end of that Session we brought the matter before Lord Morley, and the model clause was altered so as to cover that case. Instead of saying "any house shown on the deposited plan," it now reads (as you will see in the print), "Any houses purchased or acquired by the company for or in connection with any of the purposes of this Act, whether purchased or acquired in exercise of the powers conferred by this Act or otherwise, and whether before or after the passing of this Act."

Chairman—continued.

64. So that particular form of evasion cannot occur again?—No, not if the company comes to Parliament with a Bill on the subject at all—for any powers in connection with the purposes for which they have taken the land.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

65. Does that clause prevent them acquiring by private treaty?—It does not prevent their acquiring by private treaty. All it says is: If you acquire by private treaty and come to Parliament for any powers in connection with the matter then you must rehouse.

66. But if they do not come to Parliament?—If they do not come to Parliament at all, or if they do not come to Parliament with any Bill touching on the subject at all, then we cannot reach them.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

67. Do you say that it is your view that a railway company can own land without Parliamentary powers?—I do not feel competent to express an opinion; but what I say is that the clause was originally drawn on the supposition that the law was that they could not.

68. That is your view of the intention of the clause originally?—The clause as originally drawn was drawn on the supposition that a railway company could not take land without coming to Parliament for powers.

69. If that were acted upon at the present time that would bring under the purview of Parliament the acquisition of the houses on the land by private agreement, would it not?—If the company comes to Parliament at all, then this clause is wide enough now.

70. I want to put this quite clearly; your view is that the matter originally rested this way—that a company cannot acquire land without coming to Parliament. That is the first thing, is it not?—That was the supposition on which the clause was drawn.

71. That is dealing entirely with a railway company, and therefore they having to come to Parliament for land, whatever happened in connection with private agreements previously in respect of houses would also come under the purview of Parliament?—Yes.

72. Therefore if this clause was carried out in the spirit of its author originally, this private-agreement acquisition of houses would be one of the questions which would come before Parliament?—Certainly. I think the intention of the Order as originally drawn was to cover all purchases of houses by a railway company.

73. And if there is any weakness in the clause now, as disclosed by practice, it is desirable that the clause should be strengthened so as to get it back to the original intention?—Yes; but, of course, you cannot hit the company unless it comes to Parliament for something.

Chairman.

74. Only, on the other hand, according to you, a railway company would not be able to acquire land

Chairman—continued.

land without coming to Parliament. Will you give us information as to the difficulty which arose in the Broad Street case? What was the date of that?—That was early last year.

75. In 1901?—Early in 1901. It was, by the Shoreditch Borough Council, brought to the notice of the Home Office that the London and North Western Railway Company were taking certain buildings near Broad Street Station called the Broad Street Buildings, and were preparing to displace the working classes inhabiting those houses; the number of tenements was stated as 156, and the number of persons affected as 585. The Home Office wrote to the London and North Western Railway Company asking them under what power they were acquiring the houses. They replied that they were "not aware of any Act of Parliament authorising the company to make any further extensions of their Broad Street Station or to acquire property adjoining thereto." Then later on they wrote further, and explained that they had agreed to purchase the buildings from the Land Securities Company, and that they had "no express statutory authority to acquire the land."

Viscount *Hampden.*

76. Are those the terms?—Yes. "The company have no express statutory authority to acquire the land." Then the case, as is well known, came before Parliament, and led to the rejection of the company's Bill The company have since written to the Home Office during the present Session.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

77. What date?—21st February of this year.

Viscount *Hampden.*

78. Are they the legal owners?—I presume they are the legal owners; I cannot give an opinion upon their title. This is what they say: "After the discussion in the House of Commons last year, the directors, while retaining their opinion as to the legality of the transaction, fully recognised the feeling of the House in the matter, and they instructed their land agent to endeavour to cancel the purchase; inasmuch, however, as the vendor company are in liquidation, it has not been found practicable to carry this out, or to find another purchaser. In these circumstances the company will have to retain the property, but it is not their intention to displace any of the inhabitants, and they have given orders that so soon as the purchase is completed and possession obtained, the dwellings shall be restored and repaired and let to the same class of tenant as heretofore." Then they gave this important promise: "Should occasion arise in the future to utilise the property for railway purposes, application will be made to Parliament in the usual way for the necessary powers."

Chairman.

79. Is that all you have to say with regard to that particular sort of evasion?—Yes, that is all I have to say upon that.

80. Then have you any other kind to tell us of?—Yes. Another question that arose on the St. James's and Pall Mall Electric Lighting Bill, 1899, turned on the definition of the word "house." It was found that the company in this case proposed to take two model dwellings—one containing 15 tenements, the other containing 16 tenements—and that they were reckoning those two model buildings as one house each, so that they regarded themselves as not coming within the Standing Order; they made no deposit, and they inserted only the short form of clause in their Bill.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Bond.*

81. What happened upon that?—In that case they were opposed by the St. James' Vestry and Westminster. I think they did not succeed in making a modification of the Bill. The Home Office heard of it only very late in the Session, and we did not think it possible to propose to insert anything on the subject of the meaning of the word "house" in that Bill. We took the view rather strongly that "house" meant not "building" but "separate tenement"; and that view was afterwards confirmed by the opinion of the Law Officers.

Chairman.

82. That view has now been embodied in the new Standing Order, has it not?—Yes. At the end of that Session we suggested to Lord Morley and Mr. Lowther the alteration of the Standing Order by the introduction of a definition of the word "house," and that was accepted by both Houses.

Mr. *Bond.*

83. Has that been done?—Yes, the word "house" is now defined by the Standing Order: "The expression 'house' means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling."

Chairman.

84. So that particular form of difficulty cannot arise again?—That cannot arise again; and in this particular case we were quite prepared to have enforced our view without that definition appearing in the Statute or Standing Order.

85. Still, practically, that form of evasion is no longer possible?—It is no longer possible; in fact, in this particular case it did not occur.

86. We need not go further into that particular case, I think. Can you name any other form of evasion which you have met with?—Another way in which the Standing Orders have been escaped has been by breaking up a scheme, and taking part of it in one Session and part of it in another—that is to say, if a scheme involved the taking of (say) 30 houses, then that was done by two Bills—one taking 15 houses one Session, the other taking the remaining 15 the next; so that neither of the Bills contained the obligation to rehouse.

87. And how does that matter stand now?—In the particular case where that actually happened—it was the London School Board who did it—provisions were inserted in one of their Bills requiring the schemes of five years to be treated as though they had all been included in one Bill. That is a point on which for general purposes the Standing Order is still deficient. I mean, it is still possible, while adopting the model clause, to break up a scheme in that way.

88. Does

Mr. *Bond.*

88. Does not the model clause provide for that now?—No; there is nothing in the model clause to provide for that; I am not aware that it has ever been attempted in any other case; but the same difficulty may arise in cases where there are two or more Bills in successive Sessions, and especially where there is an extension of time for the exercise of some power.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

89. Does not the case also arise in the event of 10 houses being taken in one borough and 10 house in another?—Yes. I do not know whether you can call that anything like an evasion, because the Standing Order only applies to each borough separately. It is quite possible that a company might take 10 houses in every borough in London, and still not be required to rehouse.

90. Suppose on each side of a road or street they took 10, one side of the road being in one borough, the other side in another?—There would be no requirement to rehouse there.

91. They would not come under the clause?—They would not come under the clause.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

92. Is there any definition of "area"?—Yes.

93. Where is that?—The definition of "area" you will find in the Standing Order on page 4: "The expression 'local area' means—as respects London, the City of London, and any Metropolitan borough."

Chairman.

94. That defect then still exists in the Standing Order?—That defect still exists in the Standing Order, and it is very likely to give rise to difficulties in cases where there is extension of power, where, for instance, a company has taken power in a Bill to take 30 houses, and it deals with (say) 15 of them, and then obtains an extension of time for the remaining 15.

95. Have you considered any mode of dealing with that difficulty?—It seems to me that it could only be dealt with—if it is necessary to deal with it—by some more general clause: that, instead of inserting in each Bill a clause dealing with the lands taken by that Bill, you should put the company once for all under a sort of obligation to deal in this way with all houses of the working classes which they may take; but, of course, that would be going a great deal beyond the present law.

96. You say, "If it is necessary to deal with it." Have you any doubt as to whether it is desirable to deal with it?—That, of course, involves the question of whether it is necessary to deal really with every single case in which a company takes any one house inhabited by the working classes. That seems to me rather a question on which the Committee should decide.

97. You do not express a positive opinion?—I do not express an opinion.

98. As to whether it is desirable or not to deal with it?—If you wish to carry the clause further it would be best to make the obligation of the railway company a continuous one.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

99. Would not the case be met by insisting on a clause in any new Bill—if it referred to a site previously dealt with on a previous Bill—that the same power should obtain?—You do that now; but the difficulty is that the site may be divided, and part come within the old Act and part within the new; and the part left under the old Act may contain less than 20 houses. I think, so long as you have the limit of 20 houses, you can hardly extend it beyond the Bill you are dealing with.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

100. You view this particular question, I gather, as a matter of policy?—I view this particular question as a matter of policy.

101. For the Committee?—Yes.

Chairman.

102. And as one on which you yourself prefer to express no strong opinion?—No strong opinion except that I think it would be possible to frame a clause that would cover all these cases by making the obligation on the company one that would cover all future purchases by them. Whether the companies would resist the insertion of such a clause I do not know.

Mr. *Bond.*

103. Never to take any house without replacing, you mean?—Never to take any house without replacing.

Lord *Wenlock.*

104. Doing away with the limit of 20 houses?—Yes; or you might have some new limit.

Viscount *Hampden.*

105. But if the railway company is to be so treated, why not every corporate body?—Well, I presume it would apply to any body coming to Parliament for powers.

106. I understand you to say that the railway company does not come to Parliament for powers in every case in which they acquire land?—A railway company like the London and North Western are never likely to be more than one or two sessions without coming to Parliament for some powers.

107. Not with respect to the particular houses?—No; but you might, the first time the company came to Parliament, have a clause inserted that would cover any future purchase of land.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

108. The real question is whether the railway company have any right of owning property without express Parliamentary powers, they being a Parliamentary company, is not that it?—That may be a question with regard to railway companies, but it is not a question as regards limited liability companies.

Lord *Lamington.*

109. Is not Sub-section 11 very strong, going back five years?—Yes, I think it is rather a strong thing.

Lord *Lamington*—continued.

110. Suppose the people were to migrate voluntarily, of their own accord, it would still be in the power of the Secretary of State to insist upon an adequate number of people being provided for?—Yes. If it was clearly shown to the Secretary of State that that had happened, he would not, I imagine, insist upon those who had migrated voluntarily being included. It is not an absolute requirement; it is only to rehouse such number as the Secretary of State might require to be rehoused.

111. You could not tell whether they had or not. Suppose the site had been cleared for five years?—It might be a very difficult question to settle.

112. In fact, it would be impossible, would it not?—It might be.

Chairman.

113. Would you just tell us how that No. 11 came to be inserted?—It came to be inserted in the case I have already mentioned—the South Eastern case of 1889. The company had been taking the lands and displacing the working classes before they came to Parliament for powers.

114. It is a very strong sub-section. Can you tell me the circumstances under which that was inserted in the long model clause?—Nothing more than the fact that railway companies certainly might evade—and in one or two cases certainly had evaded—the general provision by getting the working classes displaced before the date which was fixed in the model clause. The subsection originally covered three years; then afterwards it was extended to five years.

Lord *Lamington.*

115. Still that applies; it is a gradual process; it is not done *en bloc*?—It only dealt with a possible evasion.

116. Still it was an actual gradual displacement, not a sudden displacement, in this case you refer to?—It was a small displacement.

117. And with the extended period of time—three to five years—it would be gradual—people might have their tenancies taken from them; they would not be turned out into the street?—No, I should not think they would be turned out suddenly. The companies are now careful not to do that.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

118. In some cases they were, were not they?—There have been, I believe, such cases.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

119. It was a displacement, and it was directly connected with the fact that the company were going to Parliament in connection with the particular area, was it not?—Which case are you referring to?

120. Take the 1889 case?—It was certainly done. It is admitted in the clause inserted in the Bill that it was done with a view to coming to Parliament for confirming power.

Mr. *Kearley.*

121. It was done, was it not, two years before they came to Parliament?—Yes, more than a year before they came to Parliament.

Lord *Lamington.*

122. It would be a very speculative thing on their part, would it not?—Railway companies very often know beforehand what houses they are going to take.

Mr. *Kearley.*

123. This was an evasion; they knew, did not they, that they were coming to Parliament?—Yes, no doubt.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

124. Did not you say that very often a railway company was inclined to go to the owners of property when they had a Bill in view and say to those owners: Now look here, we will buy privately from you, because if we do so we do not come under the rehousing obligations; and therefore as we shall be saved that expense we can afford to give you a better price. Has not that kind of case arisen?—That is the sort of case we are speaking of now. I cannot give you details or particulars of other cases; I am satisfied that there were such cases and that this clause was inserted in order to prevent them.

Lord *Lamington.*

125. In your opinion has that sub-section hampered enterprise; is there a check placed upon enterprise by it?—I should think Sub-section 11 does not hamper enterprise more than the whole clause does. I have no doubt that the railway companies will say that the whole obligation to rehouse is a considerable hampering of their enterprise; but I do not think this clause, which merely stops up a gap, as it were, in the obligation, adds to the objection.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

126. That clause, I take it, was adopted from the direct recommendation of the Royal Commission in 1884, was it not?—Which?

127. It is given in page 9 of this memorandum. If honourable Members will look at page 9 they will see the words. I was on that Commission, and I remember we had a good deal of evidence about it, and recommended the alterations of the Standing Order to meet it?—Yes, the Standing Order was their recommendation; and then they said in their Report: "As these special recommendations were of a somewhat provisional nature, the matter involved being of great urgency, it is quite possible that the amendments are capable of being made more effective, and that Standing Orders may be further strengthened on some points by legislation"; so that in amending the Standing Order and model clauses we were no doubt carrying out the intention of that Commission. I think that pretty nearly exhausts all I have got to say about possible evasions. Of course, the adding of these different provisions to the clause has made the clause rather a complex one, and rather difficult to construe and enforce. It seems to me it would be better if a simpler form of clause could be adopted as I have suggested, making the obligation continuous. Possibly it might provide for some sort of debtor and creditor account with each railway company; that they should register, we will say, with the Home Office, every house or every group of houses beyond a certain limit

which

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

which they took, and that they should be debited with those houses, and then that they should be credited with every new building that they provided in their place.

Chairman.

128. Now are you authorised by the Home Office to make any suggestion with regard to any possible deficiencies in the clauses as they stand?—No, I am not authorised to come here to make any recommendations to the Committee. There are one or two points which may come before the Committee on which I might perhaps say a word.

129. If you would point out to us any points that you think are likely to arise on which you can say anything yourself?—I think one point that is likely to be suggested to the Committee is that the plans and the statements of the number of persons to be displaced, which are deposited at the Parliamentary offices and at the Home Office, should also be deposited with the local authority, and as far as the Home Office is concerned I do not think there would be any objection to that. Of course we are always glad to have the co-operation of the local authorities, and in many of the cases which I have mentioned the matter has been brought forward by the local authority.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

130. That provision is already adopted in some cases, is it not?—Yes.

131. In the South Eastern Railway Act of 1897 does not that exist?—I do not remember the South Eastern.

132. And in the Thames Tunnel Act too?—It certainly exists in a recent South Western Act. Then another suggestion that has been made is that the numbers displaced should be certified by the local authority. That is a suggestion that I do not think we should wish at all to recommend.

Chairman.

133. Why?—I do not think the companies would take the certificate of the local authority as being at all a certificate from an impartial body. Of course at present the numbers are settled by the Home Office after the Act is passed, when the question of rehousing actually comes forward in any scheme.

134. I do not quite follow. Do you mean that the recommendation which is likely to be submitted to us is that the numbers as certified by the local authority to the Home Office should be taken as correct?—I think that is a suggestion that is made—that it should be taken as correct as certified by the local authority.

135. Should you have any objection to the local authority sending in a statement of their own, as to what they believed to be the number, to the Home Office without its being accepted necessarily?—We should be quite ready to take any assistance that the local authority could give in determining the numbers.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

136. But you would not recommend that the local authority should be empowered to issue a certificate which would be binding as to displacement?—No.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

137. You object to that?—Yes, I think so. I think the local authority are interested in that question in a way that would hardly make them a proper authority for this purpose.

138. Surely they are the sanitary authority?—Yes.

139. And as the sanitary authority the question of overcrowding under the Housing of the Working Classes Act comes to them for administration?—Yes; therefore I think any representations they make are certainly entitled to be considered, but I hardly think that makes them a proper authority to say what number of houses have been occupied by persons of the working class.

Chairman.

140. You think it right that the Home Office should ascertain that for itself?—Yes; I think it best that the Home Office should ascertain that.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

141. The Home Office has to go to the Local Government Board Office in this matter, do not they?—Oh, no.

142. Not under the Public Health Act?—No; it is done direct by our own officer.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

143. Is it your experience that the Home Office does at the present time go to the representative of the local authorities as to the numbers?—Yes, I should certainly think so. You will get that more directly from the next witness. But the suggestion, as I understand it, is likely to be that instead of being settled afterwards—after the Act is passed, and when the question of rehousing really becomes a practical one, or really becomes a critical one—that when the returns are presented to Parliament before the Bill is passed, there should be a certificate as to the numbers. Of course, the certification of numbers absolutely at that stage would involve a great deal of unnecessary work, because in a considerable proportion of cases the Bills are thrown out, and in other cases, even if the Bill passes, the taking of houses is never carried out. It seems to me much better that the matter should as at present be settled when the scheme for rehousing actually becomes a practical one.

Chairman.

144. Might it not be possible during the progress of the Bill through Parliament for an alteration to be made artificially in the number of persons inhabiting those houses?—Of course the numbers have to be ascertained——

145. For instance, the landlord might eject them; he might give them notice?—The numbers have to be ascertained on the 15th day of December last previous to the passing of the Act.

146. Quite?—It no doubt adds to the difficulty of ascertaining the exact numbers after a lapse of time; still I think a satisfactory conclusion has been come to in all the cases where it has had to be done.

147. You think there has been no practical injustice of any sort or kind?—I do not think so. In this Session Mr. Steward, the Home Office

Chairman—continued.

surveyor, in two cases where the question was raised as to whether the returns were correct, made enquiries as to the numbers; in one case, that of the London and Brighton Electric Railway, the numbers were found to be somewhat greater than the company returned; but in that case the Bill was actually thrown out for non-compliance with Standing Orders—partly on that very point.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

148. Had the Home Office accepted the figures on that point in that case?—The Home Office does not accept or reject the figures while the Bill is passing: but in this particular case an inquiry was made to check the figures, and it was found that the London and Brighton Electric Railway Company's figures of the numbers were somewhat below the exact numbers.

149. That inquiry was conducted by the London County Council, was it not?—The inquiry I am referring to was made by the Home Office.

150-1. And you came to the conclusion that the numbers were not sufficient?—Were not quite sufficient—no. There was also an inquiry by the London County Council, I believe, but I am not able to say the result of that.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

152. In the case of the City and Great Northern Railway had the Home Office checked the figures of the promoters before I brought the matter before the Home Office?—No, we had not checked the figures at all.

Chairman.

153. Passing on from that point, do you know anything further which you think is likely to come before this Committee on which you would wish to express any opinion?—It is very possible the question may arise whether a little more latitude might not be allowed to the railway company in the place where they rehouse the people. Hitherto they have been required to rehouse—at least, originally they used to be required to rehouse—them in the same district as that where they were displaced, and it is now suggested that the clause might be modified so as to allow them (say) to rehouse them some miles in the country, and (in the case of a railway company) bring them up if they want to work in town by cheap trains.

Lord *Wenlock.*

154. Only railway companies?—Only railway companies, as they are the only ones likely to be able to afford facilities for their coming up.

155. You said you thought railway companies might be allowed more latitude; would not you allow companies generally more latitude?—Yes, companies generally; but in the case of railway companies, it is easier than in the case of other companies, because they may be able to provide the people with the means of coming to their places of work.

Mr. *Crean.*

156. With the approval of the Home Office? It would be part of a scheme approved by the Home Office; and that is a policy that the Home

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

Office has rather tried to encourage. In the case of the South-Eastern Act of 1900 we allowed a clause to be inserted——

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

157. Is that the Act relating to Hither Green?—Yes. That is a case where a clause was inserted to the effect that "if it shall appear to the said Secretary of State that, having regard to the congestion of population in the immediate neighbourhood of the houses purchased or acquired by the company, in respect of which new dwellings are to be provided, or for sanitary or other reasons, it is desirable that such new dwellings, or a portion of them, should be provided in some more open place or district, he may approve of a scheme for providing the new dwellings, or such part of them as he may determine, in such other place or district as he may approve, and on such conditions as he may think fit, whether with regard to the provision of gardens, open spaces," and so forth. That was inserted in the South-Eastern Railway Bill of that year, and it was added by Lord Morley, in a note to the model clauses, so that other railway companies might adopt it; but, as a matter of fact, the South-Eastern Railway Company did not carry out the suggestion of rehousing the working classes at Hither Green, and other companies have not adopted the clause. I believe the reason they give is that they really cannot run more workmen's trains than they do now, and that therefore it is a burden to have to rehouse the working classes in the country; at all events, it is an arrangement the Home Office has been quite ready to fall in with, but which the railway companies have not found it to their interest to adopt.

Chairman.

158. Then, what have they done?—They have gone on rehousing them in the congested districts.

159. Rehousing them in the districts from which they are displaced?—From which they are displaced.

160. Of course, it is conceivable that it might be a very considerable hardship to those persons who are displaced to be rehoused at a distance from the place where they had previously lived. I suppose that is a matter which the Home Office would take into consideration when the scheme was submitted to them?—Yes, and certainly the idea in this case was that that should be met by running cheap trains to and from the places to which they were taken.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

161. Do you suggest that the Hither Green scheme was a good one?—I am not competent to give an opinion upon the Hither Green scheme in particular.

162. Why not?—The Home Office approved of it?—That does not come to my Department of the Home Office; but what I do say is, that the general idea of it is a good one.

163. You do not commit yourself to the detail of that case?—I do not commit myself to the detail; you will get that from the next witness, if you want it.

Chairman.

164. Is there any other further remark you would like to make to us?—Another possible suggestion is that the congestion caused by the schemes might possibly be met by the removal of factories from the crowded districts to the country. Of course, that is rather a general suggestion, but it might possibly come into a railway scheme in this way—that a company might acquire a factory (say) and arrange for its removal to the country.

165. And all its employees as well?—Yes, and all its employees as well. In this connection it is perhaps worth mentioning the case of Peek, Frean and Co.'s factory, which certainly could not be called a case of evading the clause; and yet it seems to have been rather an unfortunate case in the way of dishousing the working classes.

166. What happened in that case?—I cannot pledge myself as to the facts, but as an illustration I think it is good. In that case the South Eastern Railway Company bought a large portion of Peek, Frean's factory alongside their line, and Peek, Frean and Co. meantime acquired a large block of working-class houses on the other side of their factory, so that they dishoused a large number of the working classes on the north side of their factory, while they sold to the South Eastern Railway Company the southern part of the ground on which their factory stood.

Mr. *Kearley.*

167. There are no houses in the southern part now; it is all factory, is it not?—I do not know whether there are actually houses.

168. I think not; the part sold was the factory?—At any rate in this case indirectly the extension of the railway led to the displacement of a large number of the working classes without any evasion of the statute, and yet without any remedy for the working people. What I should put to the Committee is this—I cannot say whether it could have been done in this particular case, but it would be a very good thing if in a case where a railway company wished to take any part of a factory it could be somehow put down to their credit if they arranged for the factory being removed to the country with the employees, thus diminishing the congestion in the particular part of London where the thing occurred.

Chairman.

169. As a rule that would be a matter of very large expense to the company, would it not?—Yes, but if they (as they did in this case) want to acquire the ground on which the factory is standing——

170. You think then that those conditions are fair and might be imposed upon them?—I think it might be in some way credited to them that they had diminished the overcrowding in the neighbourhood, by arranging for the removal to the country of the factory and its employees.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

171. The owner of the factory comes in there, does he not?—Of course, it would have to be a matter of arrangement with the owner of the factory. I believe, according to the evidence given before the Royal Commission in 1884, that that was how the difficulty was met in the case of the Birmingham improvements—that there the factories were removed from the centre of the town, with the persons employed in them, and that this very much diminished the pressure.

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

Chairman.

172. I have no further question to ask. Have you any further remark you wish to make?—I have here some figures which show to what extent it might be possible to relieve the congestion in London by the removal of factories to the country. The figures I have got have been supplied to me by the Factory Department. They relate to the number of factories in London employing more than 100 persons each. I find that there are 748 factories in London employing more than 100 people—the total number employed in those factories is close on 200,000. That, no doubt, would represent—taking three persons, say, to each employee—a population of about 600,000 at the least.

Lord *Lamington.*

173. Which London does this represent?—The county of London, the administrative county of London. Then in order to judge as to which classes of factories might possibly be made the subject of removal to the country they are classified to a certain extent; for instance, there are 50 machine makers factories, 30 bread and biscuit factories, 14 cabinet making factories, 11 factories making preserves from fruit, 16 breweries, 47 bookbinding establishments, 72 printing establishments (not including newspapers), and 19 saw mills, and so forth. I have ascertained that in those classes of factories there is already a very considerable tendency to remove the factories to the country. For instance, the very largest cabinet makers in London have recently removed their houses to the country. These figures are given merely to show that there is a considerable scope in the possible removal of factories from London to the country if that could be in any way under the scheme arranged with the railway companies or other companies.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

174. Can you give us the superficial area covered by those factories in London?—No; I am afraid we could not give that.

Mr. *Kearley.*

175. Is it not the question of the employee more than the question of the factory that the congestion is caused by?—My idea in bringing this suggestion forward was not primarily with a view to the possible use of the site of the factories for houses.

176. Then you are assuming of course, that all these people, or the bulk of them, are living contiguous to the factory?—Yes.

177. That is the assumption?—That is the assumption.

178. It is not actually so?—Of course, in some cases they are not; but still the census figures show that an enormous number actually live in the county of London.

 179. By

Chairman.

179. By whom would this scheme that you refer to be promoted?—It would have to be an arrangement, I take it, sanctioned by the Secretary of State as part of the scheme of rehousing of each company. I suggest that it might be arranged in this way: that we might have a sort of debtor and creditor account with the company, debiting them with all the people they dishoused and crediting them with those they rehoused, and those whom they removed with their work to the country.

180. You mean with all the companies?—With each company.

181. If it were a general scheme for removal it would have to be arranged with all the companies, would it not?—It would have to be arranged with the particular company that was dishousing. At present the company displacing (say) a thousand people must rehouse so many of them.

Viscount *Hampden.*

182. In the same area?—In the same area. All that my suggestion amounts to is saying that the number that they should be required to replace should not be so great if they could arrange for the removal of some factory in the area to the country taking with it all its employees.

183. Placing them in another area, in fact?—In another area where there is not the same congestion.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

184. They would not be the same people displaced, would they?—Presumably they would take their employees with them.

185. They might or might not?—I do not think the Home Secretary could sanction such a scheme unless it carried with it the removal of the employees of the factory.

Lord *Lamington.*

186. The employees are always changing their places themselves; they do not stay in one factory for many months, many of these men; the very skilled ones do probably. They are always changing themselves. It is not very likely that they should be willing to go down into the country; it is about the last thing they would do, I should think?—Take the case I mentioned of a big cabinet maker who removed from the centre of London to Tottenham; in that case I have not the slightest doubt that the greater part of his employees went down to Tottenham.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

187. May I ask whether your specific recommendation on this is not that we should widen the area for rehousing so that you might then make these arrangements with the company?—Yes, that is what it comes to, I think—that we should have more scope in settling the scheme with the railway company.

Mr. *Kearley.*

188. But you are contemplating something else, are not you, altogether? The figures that you gave us contemplated something else beyond where a railway came in and displaced people working at a factory. You were dealing with

Mr. *Kearley*—continued.

the general removal of factories throughout London, were you not?—Yes; but I do not suggest that it can be more than a mere item in the railway companies' work. Personally I believe that that is the chief element in the solution of the working class difficulty in London.

189. The two things are quite separate, are they not?—That is quite apart from anything else.

Viscount *Hampden.*

190. You would make it more elastic, as I understand?—That is what it would come to.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

191. Do I understand you to mean that if a railway company displaced a lot of workmen—we will say in Sunderland Street—that it would go to a factory in another street——?—Near.

192. And say: I will arrange for you and your employees to go into the country, and that in the eye of the law shall be equal compensation for what I have pulled down in Sunderland Street?—I do not say "equal compensation."

193. No, but in lieu of it?—Yes.

194. Then you would put the railway company to two expenses—the expense of removal, the purchase of the very expensive plant, and so on, of the factory, and the expense of removal?—I should not in any case enforce it on the railway company; I would only put it as an alternative to what they regard as a very heavy obligation in the way of rehousing.

Lord *Wenlock.*

195. What would you propose to do with the factory?—That would be pulled down.

196. What is to be rebuilt on the site of the factory?—I should think that the site would sometimes be the very site the railway company would choose for rehousing the rest of the people.

197. Then they would have to remove the employees of the factory to the country, house them there, and also house others? — There would probably be a certain number to be rehoused in the district.

198. That is a double rehousing, is it not?—Take the case (say) of a company that has to rehouse a thousand people; it might be a very good arrangement for them to take the site of the factory and to remove the factory and its employees to the country; if they had to house 1,000 they might remove 500, say, in the country and rehouse the remaining 500 on that site.

199. Possibly the site of the factory would rehouse 5,000 instead of 500?—Of course that would be a very enormous factory, and that could only happen where the company was displacing an enormous number of people.

Lord *Lamington.*

200. I want to go back to that Sub-section (11): Supposing they acquired land five years previously, and then, gradually, some of the tenants left, and so on, so that they did not occupy their particular houses, and at the end of five years half the property was let, would the company still be obliged to put up accommodation

Lord *Lamington*—continued.

tion for the original number of people there?—That would be a question for the Secretary of State to decide. In any scheme the number to be rehoused is either the whole number who inhabit the houses or such less number as the Secretary of State may require to be rehoused. Even if they displace the whole at the moment, it does not necessarily happen that the whole number must be rehoused; it is always in the discretion of the Secretary of State to diminish the number.

201. Does he act upon any particular principle?—I should think, in a case of gradual removal such as you suggested, where there was no previous intention of clearing them out, he might possibly make some deduction.

202. You said you thought that that subsection inflicted no greater hardship than the whole clause; but would it not, because under that you can gradually displace people?—Still, even if you do that, you are diminishing the accommodation for the working classes in the district, whether you do it suddenly or not. The main point in this case is not the inconvenience to the individual tenant who happens to have been turned out; it is the diminution of working class accommodation in the district.

203. That is what I want to arrive at. It is not the actual people?—It is not the actual people, but the diminution of working class accommodation.

204. That assumes that there are no other houses elsewhere, does it not?—It assumes that there are not enough houses to accommodate the people who want to live there without paying exorbitantly.

205. Is that the case? Is that at all proved?—Oh, I think so. Of course that is a point on which the companies are entitled to give evidence in any individual case.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

206. May I ask you a question or two with regard to the short model clause?—Yes.

207. That, I understand, is a scheme under which, if a company only takes 19 houses, or demolishes nineteen houses, it escapes rehousing?—Yes.

208. Have you any experience of the number of cases—we will say within the past five years—in which that precise number has been taken—19?—No, we should have no information as to that; certainly I do not know.

209. Have you any view as to whether it has been the custom, by way of evading what I will call the long model clause, that companies have taken up to 19?—I only know of one case where a company tried very hard to keep within the limit.

210. How did they try—what are the circumstances?—They took only 19 houses, and it was rather a question whether they had not taken more than 19.

211. When the Home Office came to look into it?—Yes.

212. But you have already told us that it has been the practice to come to Parliament in two successive Sessions and break up the scheme so as to take (say) 30 houses in the two Sessions and thereby evade rehousing?—Yes; I cannot say that that has happened in any case except the case of the London School Board. It may have happened.

213. That is the only case you have?—It is.

214. Have you any view as to the definition of the word "house" in the short model clause?—I think the definition in the short model clause is now the same as in the long model clause.

215. I will take both of them, then—I mean to say in practice is it satisfactory as it now stands?—I think so. I think it goes as far as it is possible to go.

216. Does the same apply to the expression "labouring class"?—Yes, I think it is fairly satisfactory.

217. You do not wish to suggest any alteration?—I do not wish to suggest any alteration. Of course the limit of 30*s.* is rather perhaps low, but that only applies to a small portion.

218. You would not modify that?—I do not think there is any strong case for modifying it.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

219. It is an average of 30*s.*, is it not?—Yes. The words are: "The expression 'labouring class' means mechanics, artisans, labourers and others working for wages, hawkers, costermongers, persons not working for wages but working at some trade or handicraft without employing others except members of their own family, and persons other than domestic servants, whose income does not exceed an average of 30*s.* a week." The words "mechanics, artizans, and labourers," are not subject to the 30*s.* limit, and they cover the great mass of workpeople.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

220. With regard to the long model clause, what is the way in which the company has to rehouse now?—I think you had better ask that question of the next witness.

221-2. You administrated a scheme of debtor and creditorship in connection with the companies, which would involve, of course, rehousing over a very wide area?—It might.

223. You have already, I think, in reply to a question suggested that there should be some elasticity in this matter of one area in which the company is compelled to rehouse?—I think it would make the thing easier if there was some greater elasticity, provided it was always the duty of the Home Office to see that the places chosen were suitable.

224. And although this is not particularly within your purview, you do make a recommendation as to the matter of the area that it might be wider?—I certainly think that is a point the Committee might consider.

225. With regard to the rehousing under the long model clause, are the houses in which the rehousing is done by companies pretty much the same class of houses as those which have been demolished, in your experience?—I think you had better reserve that question for the next witness.

226. I take it, therefore, you cannot give any evidence as to the matter of the rent imposed?—You will get that from the two witnesses that follow me.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

227. Or as to any hardship that may or may not have arisen because of the unsuitability of the houses provided for re-housing?—I think you had better keep all those questions for other witnesses.

228. The Home Office, on occasions, has come to an arrangement, I believe, with a company to relieve it of the obligation to rehouse, on condition of its taking up some other obligation?—I do not follow.

229. Take the Great Eastern Railway. Has the Home Office ever agreed that instead of rehousing there shall be some arrangement whereby the Great Eastern shall run more workmen's train, or anything of that sort?—I do not think there has been any formal arrangement of that sort. You will get all that information from witnesses who follow me; but I am pretty sure there has been no arrangement. Possibly, the question of running workmen's trains may have been considered in determining the number of people the company had to rehouse; but that is all a question of administration, which hardly belong to me.

230. Which another witness will tell me about?—Which another witness will tell you about.

231. Can you tell us generally as to how far there has been evasion of rehousing obligations by obtaining the property in the land and houses by private treaty. Have you got any figures?—No, I have not got any figures. I do not think we have any figures of that at all. I have mentioned the chief cases which have actually come to our notice.

232. How many cases have there been within five years—could you tell us, or put in—in which the Home Office has had this brought under their notice ,and has found the charge practically substantiated. Have you got any figures as to that?—I think at one point or other in my evidence I have given all the cases—all that I know of, at all events.

233. Has it been a pretty general experience that this sort of thing has been done by a company?—I can only say that there certainly have been cases; I should be sorry to say it had been general.

234. You would not go further than that?—No.

235. The Home Office has a right to impose a penalty upon a company in case of evasion, has it not?—In case of violation.

236. In case of violation, will you tell me the nature of the penalty?—The penalty is 500*l.* for each house.

237. 500*l.* for each house where it has not been replaced?—Yes, here are the words, "liable to a penalty of 500*l.* for every such house or site"—that is, for every house or site they appropriate without rehousing, if it is required.

238. Under the Bill. You can probably put in an actual statement of fact with regard to the amount of penalty and the number of cases in which it has been found necessary to impose it during the last five years?—I do not think that a penalty has ever been imposed at all within the last five years.

239. Is it a fact that the London and North Western were under liability to a very heavy fine last year?—It is a fact that proceedings are now going on against the London and North Western; they are not yet decided.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

240. Is it not the fact that in connection with the scheme which you told us about—the Broad Street scheme—at the time at which the second reading of the Bill was before Parliament, the Bill which was thrown out, the company was then under a heavy liability to fine?—Not in connection with the Broad Street site at all. Proceedings were then going on against the same company with regard to other houses altogether.

241. In London?—In London, yes; but no fine had been imposed then, nor has been imposed yet; the proceedings are still pending.

242. Very good. Now, can you put in the number of cases in which it has been found necessary to threaten a company with a fine?—I cannot give you that figure. I do not know whether the witnesses who follow me can.

243. Let me put the case. I understood that at the time of the second reading of the London and North Western Bill last year the company were at that time liable to a fine of 16,000*l.*, or more than that?—Yes.

244. You do not know anything about that?—I only know that proceedings are still going on; that they have not yet been settled.

245. I suppose we can have a witness from the Home Office who can give us the precise facts about that?—The next witness can give you full facts about that case.

246. I will take a note of that. I will leave the question of penalty altogether then for the next witness. One other question only: In the case of Broad Street, you have now had letters from the London and North Western Company this year precedent to the passing of the Second Reading of their Bill—letters I think that were read by the Home Secretary?—I gave you the terms.

247. In which they have given an undertaking that they will not demolish the houses, or that, if they do, they will rehouse, and take the obligations of the Bill in which that has been imposed; but, supposing that they did not wish to do that (and I gathered from you that they might not desire to use this land at all), they might go on allowing it to be used for artisans' dwellings. Has the Home Office any means of securing that the company will carry out the obligations set forth in the letters to which you referred?—I do not think we have any means of enforcing it. It is a pledge given by the company.

248. Will you read to me just the letter in which the London and North Western, in connection with the Broad Street case, gave a certain undertaking—the letter which Mr. Ritchie read. At any rate, it was this, was it not (correct me if I am wrong)? We hold this land; we propose to allow it to continue in use for artisans' dwellings?—Yes.

249. And if we do use it for other purposes and demolish we will then rehouse?—Yes, come to Parliament.

250. Exactly; they will be compelled to. There was some reference made to rent and so on. What means has the Home Office for seeing that the London and North Western carry out this obligation?—Oh, no means to enforce it. It is a promise they have made, and that is all; but I take it there is no doubt they will fulfil it.

251. But they have evaded a good many of their

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

their obligations, you must remember?—They have kept outside the terms of the statute.

252. And if they are ready to keep outside the terms of the statute, it is conceivable that they are ready to keep outside an undertaking which cannot be enforced by Parliament?—Parliament could enforce it in the same way that they exacted it.

253. This undertaking which you now have from them, and which was given in connection with the Second Reading of their Bill, is a matter you cannot enforce at all?—No; we cannot enforce it.

254. You are in their hands entirely?—That is all.

Mr. *Bond.*

255. Perhaps I ought to ask this question of the next witness; I am not quite sure. The Home Secretary has a certain power of arranging with regard to the number of people to be rehoused, has he not? He might make it less than the number actually displaced on good reasons shown might be not?—Yes.

256. But he has no power to dispense with rehousing altogether?—No.

257. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether it is so in London, but cases have occurred, I believe, in which there has been an actual plethora of houses in the district in which working people have been displaced, so that there were hundreds—or perhaps even more—of houses lying vacant within the limits of the area in question. I do not know whether such a case has ever occurred in London in your experience?—I do not think any case has occurred in London where the obligation could be dispensed with; I mean, where it could be reduced to a very small figure.

258. Where it would be reasonable?—Where it would be reasonable to bring it down.

259. It has never been a practical question?—No, not in London. I understand it has occurred in Scotland.

260. That would be a question with the Local Government Board?—I think you will probably hear of such cases from the Local Government Board.

Mr. *Kearley.*

261. Can you tell us the nature of the proceedings that are being taken against the London and North Western?—Perhaps you will keep that for the next witness.

262. It is proceedings taken by the Home Office, is it?—Yes, proceedings taken by the Home Office.

263. As regards the particular sites that are cleared, and where dishousing takes place—including sites cleared because they are insanitary—I think you mentioned there was some difficulty from time to time in keeping track of them—in keeping touch with them. Has it ever been suggested to the Home Office that a register might be kept of such sites? Would that be a practical suggestion?—I am afraid I do not quite understand the question.

264. You have stated here—I think it was when you were referring to that case of the South Eastern Railway—that these cases are sometimes

Mr. *Kearley*—continued.

lost touch with altogether, or rather that it was rather difficult to keep track of the sites which the railway companies or public companies had cleared, outside before coming to Parliament?—The difficulty, of course, is to know of them at all.

265. I want now to put to you this suggestion—whether it would not be possible to draw up some general order on the part of the Home Office so that railway companies would be out of court at once if they cleared any site, or did any underhand clearing of any site, and did not record it?—Yes; I think that would be a very good thing; only the Home Office could not do it; there would have to be provision made for it in the clause.

266. That is a point I put?—Yes, I think it would be extremely useful if we could have some record of that sort.

267. Now as regards the observations you made as to where railway companies might, you thought, house at a distance from the site they cleared—do you suggest that the people themselves are to have any assenting voice in any matter of that kind, or are the railway company arbitrarily to decide that they will rehouse at a distance and that the working people are to take that as final?—Well, of course, it is not so much a question of the individual workman as a question of the amount of the accommodation for work people whose work takes them to a particular part of London. Suppose the South Eastern cleared a site in Bermondsey, and provided rehousing 10 miles out of town, it probably would not be the same individual people who would occupy the houses; in many cases they would not be the same individuals who would occupy the houses 10 miles out of town. If any individual wanted to remain in town he would be able no doubt sooner or later to find accommodation in the place, because the pressure in that particular area would be diminished.

268. That is my very point, of course. Where is the compensation coming in to the individual who is dishoused in a particular area in which he wishes to reside if he is to be told that there is very good accommodation 10 miles out in the country. It may be that that accommodation does not fit his circumstances at all?—If the rehousing is 10 miles out in the country and there are workmen's trains running between that place and the place where he lives, no doubt the pressure for houses in that particular area will be very much diminished.

Lord *Wenlock.*

269. I am a little bit uncertain as to the operation of Sub-section 11 in the long model clause as affecting the North Western Railway. I understand that the North Western Railway have bought this property without getting statutory powers for the same, and I should like to know how it is that under this particular Sub-section 11 they are going to escape any obligations which the ordinary Act places upon railway companies acquiring compulsory powers of purchase?—Even if that clause is inserted in a Bill it will not cover that particular case because the houses are not taken "for or in connection with

Lord *Wenlock*—continued.

the purposes of the Act." If they were extending Broad Street Station and they came to Parliament for power to do that, then they would be brought in.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

270. In reference to what Dr. Macnamara said—I think it was Dr. Macnamara who suggested that provision was made for rehousing according to the requirements, and then the houses were turned to some other purpose. The question I want to ask is this: You are familiar, are you not, with the Royal Commission Report, in which it was stated that companies did provide the required housing, and then turned that accommodation into housing for other purposes after they had fulfilled the law?—Yes.

271. Have you in the Home Office had any case where not only railway companies but any company acting under a public Act have carried out their obligations, and as soon as they have carried them out have turned the houses to some other purpose?—That cannot happen now, because there is a provision in the model clause which prevents their using the houses for any other purpose for a certain period—25 years. The case which Dr. Macnamara referred to was one outside the clause altogether.

272. Then one other question: Do you consider that the evasion, as we call it, which has taken place under Section A of Clause 1 on page 6 of your memorandum, is no longer possible under Sub-section 11, or would be if the words "or sites of houses" were inserted after the word "houses"?—Yes, I think so. I should like the whole drafting of that sub-section to be reconsidered, but I think the words "sites of houses" would cover the chief evasion that still remains possible.

273. Do you think that the insertion of the words "sites of houses" in connection with the provision of five years is sufficient to prevent in the future the evasions which have taken place

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

under this Section 1?—Yes, I think that covers the chief cause of evasion at any rate.

274. Then there is one other case, and only one, that I do not quite understand: Have you suggested any remedy (or what remedy) in reference to those cases where the companies come to take their powers in bits—that is to say, where they come and pull down 15 houses under one Bill and 15 houses under another Bill the next year; have you any suggestion to make as to how to get over that difficulty?—The suggestion I made as to that was that possibly a clause might be so drawn as to make a sort of continuous obligation on the railway company.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

275. We have done that in the case of the School Board; we have made it cumulative in the particular case?—Yes, but I think it would be rather difficult to generalise that particular clause. I think it would almost want a new form of clause altogether—saying that as regards all future acquisitions of houses by such and such a railway company they shall be under this obligation to rehouse.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

276. Then do I understand that you think there would be no difficulty in the Committee providing a new Standing Order or amending an old one to meet that difficulty?—I think it might be done. I am not prepared to say that it would not be opposed by the railway companies; it would add something to their obligations, I think.

Chairman.

277. You said just now that a very slight change of draft would reproduce Sub-section 11 in a form which you would consider satisfactory; would you kindly just make that draft and hand it in?—Well, if the Committee want it I will try it, but it is not an easy clause to redraft.

Adjourned to Wednesday next at 12 o'clock.

Die Mercurii, 14° *Maii*, 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN.
Earl of CARRINGTON.
Viscount HAMPDEN.
Lord WENLOCK.
Lord LAMINGTON.

Mr. BOND.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS.
Mr. CREAN.
Mr. CLAUDE HAY.
Mr. KEARLEY.
Dr. MACNAMARA.
Sir JOHN TUKE.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN IN THE CHAIR.

MR. W. P. BYRNE and MR. H. T. STEWARD are called in; and Examined:—

Chairman.

278. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) You are a principal Clerk of the Home Office?—Yes, my lord.

279. (To Mr. *Steward.*) You are the Consulting Surveyor to the Home Office?—Yes.

280. And I suppose specially with reference to the terms of these Standing Orders, among other things?—Yes, more or less confined to that.

281. And can you tell us exactly what your relations are to one another?—(Mr. *Byrne.*) The Domestic Department, in which I am the principal Clerk, is concerned with the administration of these enactments after they become law. I have to prepare all papers for submission to the Under-Secretary of State and to the Home Secretary; and Mr. Steward, the Surveyor, advises on all practical points, carries out all local inquiries, and does a good deal of informal negotiation with the Solicitors and other representatives of the railway companies.

282. And then, I suppose, his reports pass through you to the Secretary of State?—Yes.

283. (To Mr. *Steward.*) Then you have been Consulting Surveyor for some years to the Home Office?—Some six or seven years.

284. And, of course, as we have been told, you look after the practical carrying out of these enactments. I suppose you visit the sites, and make all the actual practical recommendations?—Yes.

285. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) Now will you just describe to me, please, the steps which follow after the passing of an Act?—As I have said, the Domestic Department has solely to do with the execution of those enactments as passed by Parliament. The history of the Bills—the mode in which a certain clause has come into existence in an Act of Parliament—does not directly concern us; we start with the Act, and our duty is to see that it is carried out strictly. The Secretary of State is advised that a strict duty is imposed upon him, that he ought not to condone any departures

Chairman—continued.

from the strict letter of the law, and that he must in the case, whether of railway companies or of local authorities, see that the requirements of Parliament are carried out. Perhaps I might mention at the beginning that a considerable number of cases come before the Home Office. As regards the actual amount of rehousing accommodation provided, or to be provided, under schemes already approved since the year 1884, I may put in these figures: as regards railway and other companies, roughly speaking, nearly 18,000 persons have been displaced in that time, and nearly 15,000 rehoused.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

286. Is that in London only?—This is fn London only; and, roughly speaking, accommodation has been provided for 15,000. The similar figures for the County Council and other local authorities within the same period (that is from 1884) are:—Displaced, about 12,500; rehoused, slightly over 11,000. For clearness' sake I would beg to remind the Committee that this relates only to the requirements of Parliament in local Acts; it has nothing to do with the much more extensive action of the County Council under the Housing of the Working Classes Act.

Chairman.

287. Then that latter figure of County Council and other local authorties relates to where removals are made simply under their own Acts?—Under local Improvement Acts, or their General Powers Acts, or their Street Improvement Acts—they are called by various names—it relates to cases in which the County Council or local authority is, roughly speaking, put under the same obligations as a railway company would be. The model clause applies to the County Council as much as it does to a railway company, with one slight modification, that whereas Parliament has decided that a railway company must

Chairman—continued.

must give security to the Secretary of State for the execution of the scheme no such obligation is, as a rule, put on the County Council.

288. Now to take the case of the railway companies to which you have alluded; they displaced 18,000 you say, and 15,000 were rehoused. How do you explain that discrepancy; to what was it owing; how was it that the whole 18,000 were not rehoused?—May I give evidence on that point at a slightly later stage?

289. Certainly; go on in your own way. You will do it much better?—I thought if I took it in the order of time what I had to say would be clearer to the Committee.

290. Yes.—Having given those general figures, perhaps I ought to state next what are the first steps taken by the Department when an Act is passed containing one of these clauses. The initiative is sometimes taken by the Home Office; sometimes by the railway company or other body on whom the liability is imposed; or sometimes by a local authority who are interested in the matter by seeing or hearing of probable displacements. During the last two or three years the Home Office has made a point of directly communicating with every railway or other company which has had power given to it to displace artisans in London. A letter is addressed to them saying that the attention of the Secretary of State is called to the power which has been given to them; enquiring do they intend to exercise it, and, if so, to what extent; and reminding them that if they take more than 20 houses they must prepare a scheme. In some cases it happens that the promoters come at once to the Home Office, often at an early date, to make inquiry as to the mode of procedure; a discussion then ensues as to the liability of the promoters in respect of the various classes of persons and buildings. There is very little preliminary discussion in the case of a railway company which has had to go through the ordeal before; they are familiar with the procedure, and the practical steps are at once taken; but there are some general questions which are nearly always raised by companies with regard to their liabilities; *e.g.* it often happens that they wish to acquire houses or some interests therein without demolishing them before their rehousing scheme is approved. That is contrary to the strict terms of the Act, and they are now told that they cannot be allowed to do so. The companies occasionally protest that this is hard on them; and the Committee can understand that it is often very desirable for the companies to proceed without delay with the acquisition of superior interests in the land—an acquisition which as they state will in no way interfere with the occupation of the houses by the working classes. In previous years the Secretary of State has endeavoured to meet their wishes in that direction, the difficulty to be met being obviously great; but more recently, in accordance with an opinion of the law officers of the Crown (which I will refer to later) he has been compelled to act very strictly in this matter; he has been compelled to refuse to allow the companies to acquire even superior interests on account of the strict wording of the clause. But this decision has appeared to be in practice advantageous because he found, even in cases where only superior interests were allowed to be acquired, that by some process or another the houses rapidly tended to become empty—that although no active steps were taken to turn out the tenants, nevertheless they went.

Chairman—continued.

291. So now he never permits it?—Now he does not permit the acquisition of interests. The same principle applies to the acquisition by the County Council or local the authority as to the acquisition by a railway company. The general principle that he cannot allow acquisition before the scheme is approved does not extend so far as to say that there shall not in urgent circumstances be acquisition before the scheme is practically carried into effect; various ways are found in which this can be allowed to be done in urgent circumstances. I may mention, just as an example, that in the case of the Whitechapel and Bow Railway they were allowed in the end of the year 1900 to acquire and to demolish a few (two or three) houses which were really required in circumstances of extreme urgency for their works on condition that they did satisfy the tenants and compensate them, and find other dwellings for them, which they did to the approval of the Secretary of State. That is only one example of which I might have mentioned a few others.

292. But they are not very frequent?—They are not very frequent, and they are only allowed after full consideration in the Home Office and in urgent cases. Among the preliminary discussions which often take place with the railway companies is the question as to whether provision has to be made under the model clause for persons of the artisan class who may have to be displaced from the site which the company propose to use as a rehousing site. In former days that point never arose in any very striking way, and it was not pressed against the companies; but now I think I may say it would be the practice that a company would be required to make provision in its rehousing scheme, not only for those persons displaced by the operations authorised by the Act, but also for such persons as were resident on the site which they intended to use for rehousing.

293. Do you mean by that, when speaking of the site which is intended for rehousing, that they would pull down those houses and rebuild model dwellings which would accommodate the persons who were displaced from the other site as well as the persons resident actually at the moment on that site?—Yes. It often happens, my Lord, that the rehousing site houses a number of artisans comparatively small as compared with its possibilities; there may be gardens or the houses may be only two-storey dwellings, and a large block of five storeys high might be erected which would accommodate four or five times as many.

As

Chairman—continued.

As a rule the first practical step after the discussion of the preliminary legal difficulties is the verification of the schedule of houses to be acquired and the number of persons to be displaced. This, of course, is the basis of the liability which falls upon the railway company; and it is done in practice by Mr. Steward, who is placed in informal communication with the railway or other company for the purpose. If the Committee wish to ask any questions as to how this is practically carried out, Mr. Steward can answer them better than I can; but, perhaps, I might just mention the three legal questions which arise in connection with the practical verification. The first question is: What is a "house"? Mr. Troup has already given evidence as to what is the definition of a house, as to the meaning of "house" within the clause. The next question is: What is an "artisan"? In one case a railway company tried unsuccessfully to exclude from the operation of the clause artisans earning more than 30*s.* a week; they interpreted the clause as meaning that even artisans were not to be provided for unless their wages were less than 30*s.* a week.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

294. Which was that case?—It was the Whitechapel and Bow Railway, I think, 1900.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

295. It requires the average to be 30*s.*, does it not, taking the whole number together?—Yes; any artisans employed in manual labour other than domestic servants, earning less than 30*s.* a week.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

296. What requirement is that? Where do you get it from?—The Home Office set it up and have maintained it to be the correct interpretation.

297. That is the Home Office interpretation of the definition?—Of the definition, yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

298. What date was that, 1900?—I think it was in 1900. The third legal point which arises in this matter of verifying the schedule is that some railway companies wish to exclude from their rehousing operations persons who work more than a mile away from the scene of the displacement. The model clause provides in Sub-section (1) *a* that they must obtain approval to a scheme for rehousing such number of persons as the Secretary of State thinks fit, regard being had to the number of persons "residing in such houses and working within one mile therefrom." The companies have contended that the Secretary of State has no right in deciding on the number of persons to be rehoused, to consider those who, although resident on the site, work more than a mile therefrom. The decision of the Home Office has been that it is right and proper for the Secretary of State to consider all such persons wherever they work. If they reside on the site they obviously have

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

reasons for residing there, and if they are deprived of their dwellings it is thought right that they should be considered in the rehousing.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

299. Then the Home Office has gone further than the model clause—is that so?—That is the interpretation that we put upon it.

Chairman.

300. But the words are in the model clause, are not they, "residing in," which clause is it?—It is Sub-section (1) *a*; page 6 of the printed paper which Mr. Troup handed in.

301. "And working"?—Yes.

302. The strict reading of that surely means that they must work within a mile?—Might I call your Lordship's attention to the fact that the Secretary of State must have regard to quite a number of other considerations. He "shall have regard" to the number of persons residing in such houses and working within one mile, and "to the amount of vacant accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood," and "to the place of employment of such persons, and to all the circumstances of the case." The latter words seem to give a very wide power.

303. What, so wide as to enable you to override the words: "and working within one mile"?—It is not held, my Lord, to be over-riding them; it is simply held (and I may say, recently, with the consent of the railway companies, because no serious opposition has been made to it) that it is a reasonable requirement of the Home Office to consider these persons. But I was about to add that, although such persons are not excluded from the Secretary of State's consideration, he would certainly give consideration to the number of persons not working in the neighbourhood when he came to fix the exact number who had to be rehoused. The first step, if I may say so, is to consider what number of persons there are as to whom the company is or may be under a liability. Then the second question is: How many of those persons will the Secretary of State require to be rehoused? If I may sum up, the Secretary of State holds that the persons not residing within a mile come into the first number, and that he must consider them; but he also considers them in deciding upon the number, and if a large number of persons did work out of the neighbourhood, he would, in proper circumstances, probably reduce the number to be rehoused on the spot. It might perhaps be convenient here for the Committee to hear Mr. Steward explain how he carries out the important work of verifying the schedule.

304. (To Mr. *Steward.*) Yes. Would you kindly tell us, Mr. Steward, how you proceed to verify this schedule of houses?—I send a duly qualified assistant round from house to house and enquire at every house the number of people that are living in it, more or less their names, their occupations, and what rent they pay and what wages they earn per week; because in some instances the question of the wages that they earn is material in deciding whether they come within

the

Chairman—continued.

the definition of "mechanics, artisans, labourers, and others." Having made that inquiry I confer with the company (whatever it may happen to be) as to the number of people they displace; very often I make the number more than the companies do. As a rule we agree within a very small number; because I can unhesitatingly say that I think the returns made by the railway and other companies that have been sent to me are as accurate as they can be, but the population in such houses is a very fluctuating one, and you will frequently find, if you go at a month's interval, that there is a serious difference; you frequently find an increased number—more frequently from birth than anything else, the number of children—but there is really no difficulty in ascertaining and checking the number as returned by the companies of the number of occupants of the various houses. Having done so, I then report to the Home Office the result of my enquiries, pointing out any matters which the company's representatives have suggested to me—for example, that they are not liable to rehouse in respect to so and so, and so and so. Then that matter goes to the Home Office and they decide those several points, some of which Mr. Byrne has been just alluding to in the evidence he has been giving you.

305. Then your duty, of course, stops there for that purpose?—Yes.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

306. On that point might I ask: Do you take into account the actual number there or the actual number that ought to be there considering the accommodation; in other words, do you take into account the question of overcrowding?—I simply go into the question of what is the number there; whether they are overcrowded or not. (Mr. *Byrne.*) After Mr. Steward's enquiry, which is often assisted by information supplied by local authorities (by a borough council, for instance, who write to the Home Office giving details), the next point is to inform the company or the local authority, as the case may be, either that they are free from liability or that they must submit a scheme, and that that scheme must provide for so many persons. Of course, if the enquiry elicits the fact that they are only taking 18 or 19 houses they are by law free from any liability, and the Secretary of State merely says that he is satisfied that they are free.

Chairman.

307. Of course that would have been reported to you by Mr. Steward?—By Mr. Steward; yes. But there are cases in which the Secretary of State does not insist on a scheme being prepared, although more than 20 houses are being taken. It may happen that it would be quite unreasonable to provide further accommodation in that particular district. Even in London there are such cases, and I have no doubt that in the less crowded districts with which the Local Government Board deal a similar experience exists, viz.,

Chairman—continued.

that there are cases in which it would be unreasonable. I might, perhaps, give in brief the particulars of one such case to exemplify what I have said.

308. Certainly.—The case I allude to is the case of the Tower Bridge Southern Approach, authorised by the London County Council Tower Bridge Southern Approach Act, 1895. As soon as the Act passed the County Council, who did not propose to submit a scheme for rehousing, asked the Secretary of State to assent to their serving notices to treat for the properties required for the improvement. The Secretary of State assented to this, subject to the condition that pending his approval of a scheme there should be no displacement of the artisans. Shortly after this the Council applied to be relieved of the requirement to submit a scheme at all, the reason advanced being that sufficient vacant accommodation existed in the neighbourhood. Details were, of course, called for by the Home Office of the alleged vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood. The County Council gave the details and stated that no great clearances had been effected in the neighbourhood for some years past, and that a large number of artisans' dwellings were being erected in the neighbourhood by private enterprise. It appeared that 545 persons of the working class were to be displaced; that within half a mile of the scene there were vacant 323 rooms, which, on the ordinary calculation, would accommodate 600 persons or more; and that at that very moment at Snow's Fields, in the immediate neighbourhood, dwellings containing 623 rooms were being built by the Guinness Trustees. On this the Secretary of State agreed to dispense with the submission of any scheme for providing new dwellings. I mention that case as a typical one to show you that, although the Secretary of State has only literally power to approve a scheme, he, in order not to give unnecessary trouble, simply dispenses with the submission of a scheme, because really "the scheme," in such a case, would be the approval of the provision of no houses; so he simply cuts the matter short by saying he will take no further steps.

309. Where is that dispensing power given to him?—That dispensing power is not given at all; it only comes in this way, that the scheme must be for the provision of such number of dwellings as he shall decide. When he is satisfied that he ought to decide that the provision would be for no number at all he simply says so; and the legal result is that the company are free because they know that after that decision by the Secretary of State they will not be proceeded against for the penalties.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

310. May I ask, then, is the Home Office interpretation of the long model clause that if the Home Secretary deems it not necessary to make any provision whatever, he has the right to do that?—In practice he has; it is not set out in the clause, but in practice.

Chairman.

311. He does it?—He does it.

Mr. *Bond.*

312. Might I ask, as that has been the practice, whether there have not been instances where a kind of illusory scheme has been approved; I mean a scheme providing for the replacement of quite a small number?—There have been some very small schemes, but none extremely small. I do not remember anything smaller than 150 myself, but I will look up the point.†

Chairman.

313. Are these cases where he dispenses frequent?—No, especially of recent years. Most of the operations, both of the Local Authorities and railway companies, in recent years have been in densely crowded neighbourhoods.

314. Can you give us any approach to actual figures during the last three years or so?—I think I can say there have been none within the last three years, but if the Committee like I will have a Table prepared.

315. What is the most recent you can mention?—I think the one I have just mentioned was the most recent.

316. What year was that?—That was 1897 or 1898. (Mr. *Steward.*) I do not recollect any other, my Lord.

317. You do not recollect any at all?—I do not happen to recollect at this moment any other case where schemes have not been required.

318. And you know the history, I think, of the last six or seven years?—Yes, I will not pledge my memory, but I cannot call one to mind at the moment.

319. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) Would you pursue your statement?—On that point I have little more to say than that the number to be rehoused under the scheme approved by the Secretary of State, generally, equals the number displaced. That is almost absolutely true with regard to cases arising in recent years, which, as I have said, have arisen mostly in densely-crowded districts. There have been cases in which the district of displacement not being so densely crowded, or where on account of there being vacant accommodation there, the number to be rehoused has been slightly less, but, as a rule, at the present moment, the number to be rehoused equals the number displaced.

320. Have you ever known any case in which the Secretary of State has required a larger number to be housed than were displaced?—No.

321. I see that discretion is given to him in the long clause. It says "or for such number of persons as the Secretary of State shall, after enquiry, deem necessary"; so that that would cover, or might cover, a case in which he required a larger number to be rehoused?—Yes, but the Secretary of State has never required a larger number to be rehoused. He has allowed a larger number to be rehoused, because in one or two cases the company have desired to provide a surplus of new dwellings in order to have them counted to their credit in other schemes which they were shortly about to produce.

Chairman—continued.

322. Is there any appeal against the decision of the Secretary of State?—No, my Lord.

323. Then would you continue, if you please, your statement?—After the decision as to the number of persons for whom the scheme has to be prepared the next points which arise are generally the dealing with requests made by the company to be allowed to demolish houses before the new buildings are ready. It will be observed that under Sub-section 3 of the model clause it is provided that "every scheme under this section shall contain provisions prescribing the time within which it shall be carried out, and shall require the new dwellings proposed to be provided under the scheme to be completed fit for occupation before the persons residing in the houses in respect of which the scheme is made are displaced." That obligation is a very strict one, and the companies, in quite a large number of cases, come to the Secretary of State with proposals that—in one way or another—they may be relieved of it; and I am instructed to say that there are cases in which the obligation imposed by this section is really a very heavy one. The Secretary of State has been compelled, on consideration of the representations made to him by the companies, to do his best, while taking proper precautions in the interest of the working classes, to enable the company to get round this very serious liability.

Mr. *Bond.*

323*. He has the power to do it under the clause, has not he?—Yes, "provided that the Secretary of State may dispense with the last-mentioned requirement subject to such conditions as he may see fit." The two chief modes in which the Secretary of State has been enabled to dispense with those requirements are when the same amount of *temporary* accommodation has been provided by the company, either on the spot or in the immediate neighbourhood; and there have been instances in which the scheme has consisted (i) of a formal scheme dealing with the total number eventually to be displaced, which could not be carried out perhaps for two or three years on account of the difficulty of getting the land which was desired for the object or some other difficulty, and (ii) a temporary re-housing scheme which he has approved as a dispensation from the provisions of the other scheme. Another mode in which the Secretary of State has done his best to enable the companies to meet their liabilities without undue difficulty is by authorising a piecemeal execution of a scheme when once approved—that is to say, if a thousand persons have to be rehoused at a certain place, and the company have submitted and the Secretary of State has approved dwellings capable of accommodating those thousand persons, he allows them, when they have erected and made fit for occupation, say, 200 tenements, to displace at once an equivalent number of the persons on the site to be taken, and so on from time to time. That is found to be a practical relief to the companies. The next point which I have noted is that the companies, and the local authorities also, frequently

† *See* Appendix for Statement subsequently handed in.

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

frequently find it necessary to represent to the Secretary of State that they experience great difficulty in getting land for the purposes of rehousing. Some rehousing has to take place in districts densely overcrowded, such as Bermondsey where land is in great demand, both for industrial purposes and for the houses of the persons who work there; and there is no doubt whatever that great difficulty is sometimes experienced. It is true that the difficulty is a financial one, and that, with an utter disregard as to what price was paid for land occupied industrially, the companies could get sufficient land for rehousing almost in any part of London; but from what we hear at the Home Office it appears that the cost of procuring land for the purpose is sometimes very high. Mr. Steward, I think, can mention some instances of that. (Mr. *Steward.*) The statement is often made to us by the representatives of companies, but I could not give you any instances absolutely stating it from my own knowledge.

Chairman.

324. Generally speaking, within what distance do you require the rehousing area to be found?—Within half a mile; if we can possibly get any site at all within half a mile we prefer it; we do sometimes allow them to go to three-quarters of a mile, and we have in some few instances allowed them to go further, but we keep them within half a mile if we can.

325. And I suppose you yourselves go and inspect the district?—Every site I inspect personally myself.

326. Every possible site, so as to ascertain whether their representations are or are not well founded?—Clearly, and to see whether the site is a suitable site for rehousing, the companies invariably asking if the site would be approved as a site—not as a sufficient site, but would we accept that as a site? I always go personally and inspect the site, and then report to the Home Office that the site is, or is not, suitable for housing, and, if suitable, it is suitable for whatever may be found to be its capabilities.

327. And is it your experience generally that when a rehousing scheme has been carried out the same people are accommodated who were displaced?—I have no absolute knowledge as to that except what is no evidence—namely, hearsay knowledge, but I am told that, as a rule, there are very few of the same people really rehoused in any of the schemes.

328. Do you visit the new buildings after they have been finished?—After the new buildings are finished I inspect them, and report to the Home Office that the houses have been completed in accordance with the plans approved by the Secretary of State, and that they are now in a state fit for occupation; on that the Secretary of State gives permission for them to be occupied, and then his permission for houses to be pulled down.

329. And that last permission, I suppose, as a rule, is not given until the houses are fit for

Chairman—continued.

occupation or are actually occupied?—No, certainly not; and in more than one instance I have had to tell a company that I could not give a certificate that the houses were fit for occupation, because, although they were completed, the walls were streaming down with wet; I did not consider they were fit for people to go into, and I would not give my certificate to the Home Secretary that they were fit for occupation.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

330. I wish to ask whether either of the witnesses can put in communications which they have received from railway companies or public authorities calling attention to the exorbitant prices asked for certain areas of land for the purpose of rehousing. (Mr. *Byrne.*) The answer is: We cannot do so, because such communications as we have had have been invariably in the nature of verbal statements made sometimes to Mr. Steward and sometimes to me in conversation with the solicitors and surveyors of the persons or of the company concerned.

331. You have no specific case?—I have no specific case.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

332. Could you not obtain such information?—If I may respectfully suggest, the Committee would obtain it with much greater accuracy from the representatives of the railway companies directly.

Chairman.

333. (To Mr. *Steward.*) Now are these houses, when they are built, inspected and passed from a sanitary point of view?—They are.

334. By you?—By me.

335. Does the local authority ever interfere in any way?—Oh, yes.

336. And they are passed both by you and by the local authority?—Yes. I may state that the Home Office never approve a building as being complete without we have practically the certificate of the sanitary authority for the locality that the building is all right sanitarily; but personally I inspect—or my clerks inspect—every sanitary arrangement, every water-closet, every sink, every tap, and everything in all the buildings.

338. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) Will you continue your statement?—On the subject of the difficulty of getting land I ought to mention that compulsory powers to acquire land for the purpose of rehousing, as well as for the purposes of the undertaking, are sometimes given in the Act with which we have to deal.

338. Is it more usual than not to give such compulsory powers?—It is comparatively rare. I only know of two or three cases in which it has been given; but it is the view of the Home Office, especially in the case of companies which have to deal with congested districts, that such powers might with great advantage be taken.

339. Then presumably the procedure would be this: that the company which was proposing to acquire certain houses would beforehand have examined and found some suitable area on which

Chairman—continued.

which to rehouse and would specify that area n the Bill?—Precisely, my Lord. That is the exact object of the recommendation. We feel that if the companies adopted the practice of considering, when they were preparing their Bill, that they might require compulsory powers to acquire land for the purpose of rehousing, as well as for the purpose of widening their line (or whatever it was), they would be in a much better position to carry out their operations without interfering with the interests of the working classes than under the existing system under which they get their Act, and then come to the Home Office and say that they cannot buy land; that it is impossible to procure it in the neighbourhood, and raise all these difficulties which have to be considered at the time when rehousing ought to be actually taking place. We would like them to do it beforehand.

339*. In the case of Acts which contain compulsory powers to acquire land (you have said there are some such) is that power simply a general power?—No, it is a specified piece of land.

340. For a specified piece of land?—For a specified piece of land.

341. The procedure such as I suggested?—Yes.

342. Can you quote an instance?—Yes, in the case of the London and South-Western. I will give you the exact particulars, but speaking without reference to the books, I think I may mention that the London and South-Western Company have had such power in a recent Act in which a particular plot of land was scheduled.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

343. And the London and North-Western?—And the London and North-Western I have no doubt may have had it too.

Chairman.

344. In the case of one of these rehousings would the Secretary of State permit an area to be chosen within the district of a different local authority from that in which the removals take place?—Oh, yes. In regard to the operations, really in every case the Secretary of State pays no attention to whether or not the lines of local government cut the scene of rehousing. The next point which I have noted is this: Sometimes the clauses inserted in the Act require the scheme to be submitted to the local authority by the company as well as forwarded to the Secretary of State for his approval. On that point I may say—as was said by Mr. Troup—that the Secretary of State regards this as in any case an expedient provision. The criticisms of the local authorities are always welcomed, and I think I may say have, in some instances, been found distinctly serviceable; at any rate, they would always be welcomed as being based upon local knowledge; but the Secretary of State does not think it desirable that the preliminary approval of the local authority should be required. Every practical purpose would be met by the scheme being forwarded to them in order that such observations as were called for might be made by them to the Secretary of State.

Chairman—continued.

It is feared that if they were actually required to approve it, one other cause for delay might possibly arise. We then come to the execution of the scheme as approved by the Secretary of State, and one of the first points which arises is: May such schemes be carried into execution by the local authority or by an artisans' dwellings company on behalf of the railway company or other company on which the liability lies? The Secretary of State would assent to that. He, of course, would be compelled to secure that the scheme, although being carried out by an artisans' company, was the scheme of the railway company, because he would have to retain his powers of coercion, his powers of compulsion; and the Act, of course, only gives those powers over the railway company; so that, although he he would assent to a local authority or an artisans' dwellings company carrying out the work, they would have to carry it out simply as agents for the company.

345. Then would he take into consideration at all such questions as the rent to be charged, and so on?—Oh, yes. I have put that down as a heading to be mentioned slightly later.

346. That is coming later?—Yes, it is practically the next heading, so I might mention it now.

347. Do it in your own way; do not let me interfere with you?—With regard to the rentals it has been the practice of the Home Office for a very long time—in fact, from the beginning of this question—to assign the rentals to be allowed to be charged for those dwellings. It will be noted that the model clause contains no direct reference to rentals whatever, but the Secretary of State has always claimed the power, and has always exercised it; he has considered that unless the rentals to be charged for the new dwellings were made known to him and fixed for a definite time it could not be said that a scheme for the rehousing of the persons displaced had actually been submitted to him. The scheme might provide for dwellings of a class, and at a rental which would place them entirely beyond the reach of the persons so displaced; and in those circumstances no real practical provision for their rehousing would have been made; consequently the Secretary of State has always claimed the power, and it has until quite recently been undisputed. I believe—although the Committee will hear of that later—that the Local Government Board do not find it necessary to exercise this power in the localities with which they deal; but the Home Office has always exercised it, and the Secretary of State considers it essential; and if it should ever be held that the provisions of the model clause do not enable him to exercise that power he would strongly recommend to Parliament that the Act should be strengthened, so as to provide for it.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

348. Has he never been challenged as to carrying that out as a matter of right?—Only one company has ever disputed it; and that point is now about (possibly) to become the subject

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

of legal proceedings. Proceedings against the London and North-Western Railway Company are now in progress, but it is not certain that the form in which they have been taken will enable the question of the right of the Secretary of State as to rentals to be raised. We are anxious to have it raised, and if it can be done it shall be raised; we are anxious to have it decided; but, except in the case of the London and North-Western, no company has ever disputed it.

349. The case has been going on a year, has it not?—It has been going on a long time.

Chairman.

350. That case is not yet decided?—That case is not yet decided. The Statement of Claim and Defence have been delivered, and a day fixed for the hearing, but it is not certain that the question of rentals will be decided by it; they may require subsequent proceedings.

351. Suppose the rents to be fixed by the Secretary of State, would those rents stand for ever, or would they be liable to alteration?—They would not stand for ever?—The Secretary of State has practically decided that in an appropriate case he would be quite prepared to revise the scheme of rents started by him.

352. Does his scheme stand good unless he consents to revise it?—Yes, my Lord.

353. Then rents once fixed under a scheme could not be altered, unless the consent of the Secretary of State was obtained?—That is so, but that is so only, of course, for five and twenty years, because it is only for five and twenty years that the buildings have by law to remain dedicated as artisans' dwellings.

354. But during that time no change can be made without the approval of the Secretary of State?—Not without the approval of the Secretary of State.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

355. Has he been able to enforce that?—We believe that it is carried out; at any rate substantially. In connection with this question I might, perhaps, give a brief statement as to the case of the operations of the Midland Railway Company under their Act of 1890, on which some discussion took place with the Home Office, it appears, with regard to this question of rents. The Midland Railway Company rehoused a large number of persons under a scheme dated 1892, and in less than two years the dwellings had all been completed. The displacement took place from houses on the south-west side of Pancras Road, between Platt Street and Phœnix Street, all close to St. Pancras Station. It was a large scheme, because the estimated displacement and the rehousing both amounted to 1,376 persons, and the Secretary of State fixed a scheme of rents which were not to exceed 2*s.* 6*d.* per week per room, unless and until the Secretary of State otherwise determined. Shortly after the buildings were up the Midland Railway Company applied to the Secretary of State on the subject of the rentals; they represented that the displaced tenants to the number of 127 availed

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

themselves of the option of occupying rooms in the new dwellings at rents not exceeding the prescribed maximum; and they actually occupied 254 out of 576 rooms. The remaining 322 rooms have been let by the company to other persons of the labouring class, also at the prescribed rents. The rent of 2*s.* 6*d.* a room "is considerably below the ordinary commercial rental" (the company represented) "of rooms in the neighbourhood of Clarendon Square" (that is, where the buildings were), and "the company have a list of upwards of 250 applicants representing, a population of 1,056 persons, who are waiting to obtain rooms when vacant, but none of these are persons displaced under the scheme." Then they say that the rent fixed by the Secretary of State therefore "operates unfairly to the owners of tenement property in the neighbourhood," as everyone is anxious to get into the company's dwellings at the privileged rent of 2*s.* 6d. a room a week. Then the company went on to say that they did not see why they should be compelled to charge this low rental for persons who had not been displaced or in any way damnified by the operations of the company.

Chairman.

356. But their bargain had been this: the fact was that 1,320 persons, or whatever it was, were removed, and they had got to find lodgings for 1,320 persons?—Yes.

357. Did they adduce arguments to show why it was a hardship that they should be required to find lodgings for 1,320?—They did not, my Lord, raise any objection to the number of persons.

358. What you have stated to us amounts merely to this—that if they were private owners of the lodgings you would let them get more than 2*s.* 6*d.* a week for them?—Yes.

359. That is nothing to do with the point?—They represented it to be a hardship, my Lord, because the bulk of the persons whom they had to take in at this low rent of 2*s.* 6*d.* a week were not the persons injured by the displacement.

360. But as a matter of fact it is the case, and has been acknowledged by witnesses to be the case, that the persons rehoused are very rarely the persons whe are displaced, so that they are really housing rather than rehousing?—That is so, my Lord, what I have read out so far is the substance of the letter written by the directors of the railway company to the Secretary of State. The request at the end of the letter was, in these circumstances, that the Secretary of State "may be pleased to sanction . . . an increase from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 3*s.* 6*d.*" a room for all the tenants who are not among those displaced; and they added:—"This additional rent would increase the return to the Midland Company on their capital outlay from the 1½ to 2½ per cent. per annum."

Lord *Lamington.*

361. On the purchase?—The purchase and the capital outlay in erecting these dwellings and acquiring the land for the purpose. Well, when this proposal was laid before the Secretary of State it was not dismissed as unreasonable and left unanswered

Lord *Lamington*—continued.

unanswered, but was very carefully considered. It was obvious that there was great practical difficulty in making a distinction between the two classes of tenants; that it would never do to give "fixity of tenure" as well as fair "rents" to the tenants who had been displaced, or else they would probably have become very objectionable tenants in the artisans' dwellings; and, although the Secretary of State decided that the request that under altered circumstances a revision of the rents should take place was most reasonable, he also decided that the circumstances had not altered then; it was only a few years since the rentals were fixed; and the final decision of the Secretary of State was to this effect:—"This is the first time an application has been made for permission to raise the rents; it is understood that the object of the company in making the application is to get rid of the land"——

Chairman.

362. To get rid of the land?—To sell it; to sell the land and the houses together to someone else, so as not to have the responsibility of running artisans' dwellings. If the rentals were allowed to be raised they would be able to sell to much greater advantage. The Secretary of State, in that case, decided that it was too soon to come to the Home Office for a revision of the rental fixed in 1892; and that, if a limit was fixed at all, it should be adhered to for a longer time.

Mr. *Bond.*

363. What was the date of this case?—This was 1896.

364. That is four years?—And the Secretary of State adhered to that decision on the ground that even if it were true that they "were only getting 1½ per cent. on their outlay; they looked for their profit, not from the rental of the new buildings, but from the advantages resulting from the land which they were able compulsorily to acquire for their new works; and the matter is still in that position; the company have not renewed their application.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

365. That was in 1892, was it not?—The schemes were in 1892; the decision which I have just read was in 1896.

Chairman.

366. Of course, really the cost of the rehousing is part of the cost of the whole works under the Bill?—Yes.

367. And, as you have just told us, in your opinion, the actual area ought to be named in the Bill?—I meant that in some cases it would be expedient to do so.

368. In some cases?—Yes. The net result is this—that there is no case in which rents so fixed have been modified; but the decision of the Secretary of State is that in the case of altered circumstances he would be prepared to consider whether he ought not to modify it.

369. Have you ever known a case in which a railway company has sold buildings under these

Chairman—continued.

circumstances, and put in another owner?—We have reason to believe so, but I could not mention a special case. I have no doubt the representatives of the railway companies would be able to give particulars; I have no doubt it has happened.

370. In such a case I presume the obligations of the railway would attach to their successors?—Yes.

371. So that they would become liable to the Secretary of State's decision?—Yes. The provision that buildings must be used for artisans' dwellings, and that the rents must be so much, are to be endorsed on every conveyance. With regard to the question of rents I may say the circumstances in which a revision should take place in favour of a railway company are very easily conceivable. There is no doubt that in some districts, of London especially, wages have risen substantially in favour of some of the classes of artisans who live in such buildings. In connection with other questions which came before the Home Office it is necessarily brought to the attention of the Secretary of State that improvements have taken place in connection with the wages of artisans and other workers. The case of buildings alone—expenditure on which he, as the chief authority of the Metropolitan police, has to sanction—cannot fail to bring this prominently before him; and it would be, he considers, quite right and proper that in cases in which the artisans were able to pay a higher rent and in which such improvement of their position was not of a merely temporary character, but was likely to be permanent, a scheme of rental once approved might quite properly be modified; in fact, we have, as Mr. Steward reminds me, promised one railway company (the South-Eastern) that in five years we will reconsider the scheme of rentals fixed last year if they wish it.

372. On what ground—simply because wages have risen?—That would be one of the substantial grounds, my Lord. The obligation of rehousing is a heavy pecuniary obligation on the company. They do not get as much interest on the money which they sink in that way as they get on money sunk in the permanent improvement of their line, for instance.

373. How can they improve their line without incurring this obligation?—That is so.

374. They cannot?—They cannot; it is part of the expense.

375. Then presumably they think it worth their while to incur the expenditure of housing, and finding these houses at a rent to be fixed by the Secretary of State. They think it is worth their while to do it?—Yes.

376. Of course, the latter half of the bargain is not so good for them, or so useful to them, as the first half; but you must surely take the whole of the bargain together, must you not?—That is so, my Lord; and in pursuance of that argument the Secretary of State does not hesitate to fix the rentals for these dwellings without any reference whatever to the cost of the buildings, but with regard to the ability of the persons who are to inhabit them to pay, as defined in very large measure by the rentals they have had to pay

Chairman—continued.

for the accommodation from which they have been turned out.

377. Then where does the argument come in that the rents should be raised; what is the reason?—There has been no promise that the rents shall be raised. It was merely that as circumstances might vary (and as they certainly have varied considerably in the district of Lambeth, with regard to which the promise was given), there was no reason why the Secretary of State should not say that he would consider anything that the company wanted to represent to him at the end of five years. There is no understanding whatever that the rents are to be raised; and I should think it highly unlikely that they would be. I think, my Lord, those are substantially all the points I have to bring before you of my own accord. If the Committee desire any information as to the class of building required and erected in various localities Mr. Steward can give better evidence than I can.

378. Necessarily the buildings must vary in different localities. (To Mr. *Steward.*) Is there anything special that you wish to say to us; because, of course, we understand that if it is necessary, in different places you would require better buildings, and in some buildings of a more expensive kind?—I have nothing to say, my Lord; no particular point to bring before you.

379. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) Before you conclude your evidence in chief, are there any recommendations which you yourself have to make with regard to possible changes in the Standing Orders? Have you any remarks to make at all upon the Standing Orders from your own point of view?—I heard Mr. Troup's evidence the other day, and I may say that I concur in the recommendations that he also approved of—namely, that it would be expedient from the point of view of the Home Office that as much elasticity should be given as is possible in the mode in which the liability of the company could be carried out, combined with absolute security for the interests of the working classes; and the proposal that there should be a register of all houses taken by the companies in London for use in cases which may eventually lead to a re-housing obligation seems reasonable and desirable. I do not think it would cause much trouble to the company to send to the Home Office a list of every house inhabited by artisans which they ever take in London, whether under the powers of a new Act or under powers concealed in some ancient Act, or by voluntary purchase outside any Act if (as we know they do) they do such things. I also agree with Mr. Troup that it is expedient that schemes should in many cases, whenever Parliament thinks fit so to direct, be submitted to the local authority. I think that nothing but good can come from close communication between the local authorities of London and the Home Office in the administration of these Acts; and I think the arguments in favour of that are very much increased by the recent legislation giving to the borough councils in London the option of working Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, which really makes them the primarily responsible authority for the supply of dwellings to the inhabitants of their boroughs.

380. But you would not require their approval?—No, I see no cause whatever for their approval being required; on the other hand I see this great danger if it were, that it might lead to delay, which it is almost impossible to avoid even under existing circumstances. The Secretary of State invariably pays the most serious attention to any representations made to him by responsible local authorities; and our instructions in the Department are to bring such representations to him immediately and without fail.

381. Is that all that you wish to say?—I also agree with Mr. Troup that if a practical scheme could be devised to put the companies which frequently take land in London under a *continuous* obligation in respect to every house which they take, no matter under what powers they acquire it, it would be an advantage. At present the company are either caught by a clause in an Act, or they escape, and that seems to be inexpedient. A question arises sometimes as to whether a number of houses are shown on the plans deposited in connection with the Bill. It is then a question whether there is any liability or not; and it seems a little bit absurd that the liability of the company should depend upon the mere question of whether the houses taken are shown upon the deposited plans.

382. Are you now speaking of the limits of deviation, or what; because the houses that are to be taken of course must be marked, must they not, on the deposited plans?—Yes, my Lord; but the obligation of the company does not depend, under some of the Acts which are now in force, on so simple a consideration as whether they propose to take those houses under the Bill or not; but whether if those houses have been shown on the deposited plan, and the company afterwards desire to take them, they should be under this obligation.

383. Surely they could not take any houses without authority from Parliament, could they?—Oh no; and this question does not arise, or will not arise in future under the new model clause; but at present we are working, administratively, of course, on Acts of Parliament passed two, three, and four years ago; and that consideration seems to us to make it desirable that the companies should be under the continuous obligation. Of course, I may say that I am not instructed to make any suggestion to the Committee; the Under Secretary, Sir Kenelm Digby, is prepared to attend for that purpose at a later date should the Committee desire it.

384. No, I asked you merely if there were any remarks of your own that you had to make to the Committee on these points. Of course we quite understand that any statement you make does not go beyond your own opinion; it is not made on behalf of the Home Office?—No.

385. (To Mr. *Steward.*) Have you anything to say as to suggestions or recommendations?—I have nothing further to say.

Lord *Wenlock.*

386. Now there is only one question I should like to ask, and that is about the 25 years' limit: I understand that the obligation is placed on railway companies to provide houses for the working classes displaced by their works, and that they are to maintain them as dwelling houses for the working classes for five and twenty years; at the end of that five and twenty years are they at iberty to do what they like with those houses? For instance, are they then at liberty to make them into warehouses or a station?—I believe so.

Mr. *Bond.*

387. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) I think you said that in dealing with the houses which are acquired under powers there had been a practice at one time, more or less allowed by the Home Office, of acquiring some interest in the houses—a freehold interest, for example, or a superior leasehold interest—before the scheme had been approved?—Yes.

388. I did not quite gather what the objection was to that course being still pursued?—The objections were twofold—the first, legal; the second, practical. The legal objection was that in recent years the law officers have advised the Secretary of State that he had not power to do it, that he ought not to do it. The practical objection is that the Secretary of Sate found that when he gave this permission, by some process or other, the tenants as a matter of fact did disappear.

Lord *Lamington.*

389. How do you account for it?—I think the mere fact of its becoming known that the houses are going to be taken down in a short time will at once send out every tenant who is thinking of moving, and who has a convenient place to go to; so that the process of removal sets in automatically.

Mr. *Bond.*

390. What was the objection to that?—Because in the ordinary course such tenements would at once be repeopled by new applicants, but there is no obligation on the companies to re-let them, and therefore they became permanently empty; the stock of accommodation in the neighbourhood being thus permanently diminished.

391. By tenants desiring to leave the neighbourhood?—By these particular tenants desiring to leave the neighbourhood, and by the fact that other tenants cannot come in to fill up their places as they would do in an ordinary neighbourhood.

392. The tenancies, of course, are weekly?—Weekly in law, but of course with the usual consideration given by landlords to old tenants.

393. You mean that as a matter of fact the effect of it was to create what you would call an artificial scarcity of housing accommodation in that district for a short period?—That is so; that is the danger.

394. That is a reason which has been thought sufficient by the Home Secretary?—It is the practical reason. Of course the legal reason is an absolutely conclusive one from his point of view.

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

395. Then upon another legal point—the question of taking into account, or not taking into account rather, or only taking into account to a limited extent—the fact that the people inhabiting the houses to be taken were not working within one mile of their habitation. Have you ever had a legal opinion upon that point?—We have never consulted the Law Officers on that point. We have never had it strongly and persistently disputed by any railway company.

396. No, but as a matter of fact it is not because you are obliged by the opinion of the Law Officers to do it, or that you can, or that you must?—No, that is not the reason.

397. But with regard to what would appear to be the intention of the Act, that the people not working within the one mile of the houses ought not to be taken into account in estimating the number of people who are to be provided for?—No, it is not on legal grounds.

398. Now, with regard to the difficulty of getting replacement sites in the crowded districts. The suggestion appears to be that, in some cases at all events, the people could hardly be replaced—or rather, I will not say "replaced," because we have got beyond that question of replacement—they are not replaced?—No.

399. But the new houses could not be put up except on the sites of industrial premises, which would cost a great deal to acquire?—Yes.

400. Of course, it is not only a question of industrial premises; it is a question also of the district being as crowded, whether with business premises or with private houses, by the class of people whom we are considering (or with houses of the same class as those which are taken down), that you cannot in effect replace the people within that area or within a reasonable distance of that area without displacing somebody else—it may be middle class people, or it may be business proprietors, or it may be others—persons of the working classes?—That is so.

401. In a good many cases, I suppose, it would be people of the working class who would be displaced to make room for the new houses?—That happens frequently, not always, and I should say not in the majority of cases (Mr. *Steward.*) I think I might answer that by saying not often; because a railway company does not like to take upon its own shoulders to increase or to add something extra to the rehousing accommodation that they have to provide.

402. You say "that they have to provide"; as a matter of fact they do not have to provide it, as I understand?—As a matter of fact, they do have to provide it.

403. That is not under statutory obligation; it is an obligation imposed upon them by the Home Office?—That may be; but the site might not be approved.

404. I only want to get at whether it is so?—It is so clearly. (Mr *Byrne.*) That is not entirely a legal question. The Secretary of State has recently decided that they must so provide.

405. In those cases, what are they to do? They cannot reasonably take houses that are already occupied by members of the working classes?—They

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

—They can frequently do that "reasonably," because, as I mentioned, such houses often occupy sites that are much larger than is necessary in proportion to their housing capacity. As I have said before, you may have two storey cottages with large gardens, on which large blocks of buildings might be placed, perhaps quadrupling or more the number of persons accommodated.

406. We have had, I think, sufficient evidence upon the question of fixing the rents, except that I should like to ask on what basis are the rents fixed by the Home Secretary?—Perhaps Mr. Steward could with advantage explain what inquiries he makes upon that point. (Mr. *Steward.*) Do you mean what basis?

407. For example, we were told that in the St. Pancras case the rents were fixed at half-a-crown a room.—Yes.

408. From my experience of that district, I should not be quite certain that a room could not be acquired for half-a-crown a week in a house of the character of those houses that are put up by the railway company. Why is the rent fixed at half-a-crown in such a case as that?—I cannot give you an answer about the St. Pancras case, because that arose before I was advising the Secretary of State; but in all cases since I have advised the Secretary of State I have always borne in mind and pointed out to the Secretary of State the rents being paid by the people that are being displaced. I have also reported to him my opinion of the reasonable and fair price which should be charged for the new rents for the new dwellings. I give him my suggestion as to what I think should be the rent fixed, and it is left to the Secretary of State to decide upon the evidence put before him; he decides it—I do not.

409. The point I should like to get at is this: people are displaced very often from houses where the accommodation is insufficient, or more or less insanitary?—Yes.

410. The new accommodation which is required as being proper is of a different character?—Yes.

411. But room for room, I gather, you seem to think they ought to be charged the same rent as that which they were paying for the dilapidated houses?—No, sir. I bear that in mind, and I point it out in my report to the Secretary of State upon the rents; I have done so within the last month or six weeks. I particularly pointed out that the rents in some instances that were then being paid by the occupiers of the houses that are to be pulled down were particularly low because they were underground rooms, probably some of them absolutely insanitary, and more or less might have been shut up any day by the operations of the Sanitary Act. Therefore people were inhabiting those rooms at particularly low rentals. It was not fair to bring those rents into consideration in comparing those rooms with the new rooms that were erected by the company.

412. Another question arises with regard to that. At one time, I suppose, the policy of these Standing Orders clauses was that the actual people who were turned out should find fresh accommodation at the expense of the company, or by the provision of the company, upon the very site, or in the immediate neighbourhood of

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

the very site, of the houses from which they were displaced?—I presume that was the intention of the Standing Order.

413. Now as a matter of fact I suppose it is found that the displaced people, even when the new houses are put up in advance of their displacement, do not, as a matter of fact, come into the new houses, or, at all events, that they do not occupy the whole of the new houses?—I think you may take that as granted; it is not the whole of them that occupy the new houses. I have no means of judging for myself, but I am told by the companies and the councils that a very small number of the people really, as a matter of fact, do re-occupy; but I do not know it except from what I am told by them.

414. Then if that be the case what has the rent which is paid by the displaced people got to do with the rent charged for the houses put up in order to increase the housing ccommodation of the district?—It is in order to make the housing accommodation the same in the district. I can give you one very strong instance, if I may be allowed to do so. I think a concrete case is always better than too many hypothetical ones. This is a concrete case of a company displacing a good many hundred people. They put up the new dwellings, and the rent was fixed for those dwellings a little lower than the average rental that was paid by the occupants that were being displaced, because that happened to be a case where the rooms were good, the class of people was good, and there was no question about the the possibility of the rents being paid by the people, due regard being had to the quality of the houses that were being pulled down. I do not know whether I have made myself understood.

415. I am not perfectly clear what was intended. Do I understand that the rents charged for the new buildings were rather lower than the rents charged for the old?—In that case it came out that the rents charged for the dwellings were a little lower than the rents that the people who were being displaced were actually paying. In some other cases it works out a little the other way; but the question of the old rents paid by the people is a very large element of consideration in fixing the new rents.

416. Then in those cases where the rents are fixed at a rate which returns 1½ per cent. to the railway company (or whatever the company may be), I suppose the rents must be regarded as to a certain extent eleemosynary rents?—We know nothing—or I know nothing and the Home Office know nothing—about what return it gives the company; whether it is 1½ per cent. or any other per cent. for their outlay.

417. In addition to this fixing of the rents—as to which I do not see myself anything in the Standing Orders—am I not right in supposing that the Home Office exercises a rather stringent supervision over the plans and specifications of the buildings which are put up?—We exercise a supervision. I do not wish to say it is not "stringent," and I do not wish to admit the word, but we do exercise a supervision over the plans and reasonably, to a certain extent, over the specification, but to a very small extent on the specification.

418. Should

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

418. Should I be right in saying that the Home Office not infrequently makes requirements of a railway company with regard to the plans and materials of their buildings, which are in excess of the requirements of the Metropolitan Building Acts, and in excess of any requirements which the local authority could make?—It is perfectly true that the Secretary of State does make requirements from companies for the buildings to be in excess (in the way of construction and light and air to them) of that which is required under the Metropolitan Buildings Act, but I do not know that we require more than the local Acts. I believe that the local Acts only have reference to sanitary matters, and in that way I do not think we are in any way stricter than the sanitary authorities.

419. Do you make any stipulation as to the number of inmates of the rooms?—No, we do not.

420. The Home Office does not do that?—No, the Home Office simply sanctions the building—that is to say, it says: That building shall stand as rehousing accommodation for so many people—and the calculation which the Home Office adopts is two to a room; but we do not limit it. It rests with the sanitary laws to see that the building is not overcrowded afterwards.

421. I wish to be quite clear about it. If at a later date a larger population was housed in these dwellings the Home Office would not interfere with them, but leave it to the Sanitary Authority of the district?—The Home Office would not know it.

422. It would not come to their notice?—It would not come to their notice.

423. But then in granting this licence, so to speak, or in approving a scheme, do they say: I approve of the scheme as affording accommodation, say, for 500 people; or, that it affords accommodation for not more than 500 people?—They say: As a question of rehousing it may count for rehousing 500 people. I may say, perhaps, one word in answer to your question upon a point which, I daresay, you would really like me to give an opinion upon. The Home Office insists upon the floors of five-storey dwellings being made fireproof, the Home Office thinking that it is not safe that dwellings five storeys high occupied in separate tenancies with a common staircase in the middle should not have fireproof floors.

424. That is not required by the London Buildings Act, is it?—That is not absolutely required under the London Buildings Act.

425. Of course, requirements of that kind tend largely to increase the expense?—Oh, clearly. And I may say another way in which the expense is increased under the Home Office is this: The Home Office like to have a reasonable amount of air and space between blocks of buildings; and what the Home Office consider reasonable and proper is in excess of that required by the London Buildings Act.

426. Then, in fact, the company is being placed in the power of the Home Office—or apparently being placed in the power of the Home Office. The Home Office take upon themselves to require buildings of a class a good deal in excess of what an ordinary private builder wishing to provide artizans' dwellings would have to comply with; and they also at the other end fix the rents, in some cases, I suppose, a good deal lower than what you would call the commercial rent?—Yes, certainly, that is so. (Mr. *Byrne.*) May I interpose for one moment to say the requirements of the Home Office as regards the class of buildings are not invariably, or, indeed, usually, higher than the requirements made in the style of buildings which some companies adopt; as a matter of fact, the Home Office has approved, or expressed its willingness to approve, for railway companies, of the accommodation actually provided in the ordinary course of its business by an Artizans' Dwellings Company.

427. Which was that company—what was the case?—I may mention Brady's Buildings—the Great Eastern Railway Company, and Guinness' Trust, Snows Fields, and other cases. I mention that fact in order to show that the Home Office has not got a standard that is quite peculiar and eccentric or unreasonably high.

428. I do not remember the Brady's Buildings case?—It is quite a recent case.

429. What is the name of the company that built there?—The Great Eastern.

430. The Great Eastern? It is their building, is it?—No. The Great Eastern was under an obligation to re-house a considerable number of persons, and finding some difficulty—or, rather, being anxious to provide accommodation rapidly—they asked the Home Office if they would accept as part of their housing scheme some buildings which were then being erected by an Artizans' Dwellings Company, but which were neither occupied nor in any way assigned—neither disposed of nor assigned to tenants. The Home Office consented to some blocks of those buildings being taken over by the railway company; but as the buildings were being erected quite apart from the operations of the railway company, they did not allow them to count as an entire satisfaction of the liability imposed upon the company by the Act; they compelled them to erect some more also.

431. You cannot give me the name of that company, can you?—Oh, yes; the Artizans' Dwellings Company, you mean?

432. Yes, the Artizans' Dwellings Company?—I am sorry to say that the note I have here does not mention the name of the company that provided them, but it gives the full details of the situation, and so on. If I may, I will prepare a statement and hand it in later on, or send it to the Clerk of the Committee.

433. In that case did the Home Office fix the rents?—Yes, but I forget on what side it was.

434. I suppose you have probably no means of knowing whether they were the rents which the company themselves proposed to charge?—(Mr. *Steward.*) I have reason for knowing that they were less.

435. They were less?—Yes.

436. I suppose some arrangement took place between the Great Eastern Company and the Artizans' Dwellings Company to compensate them for the loss which they would sustain? That you

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

you have no information about?—I presume so, but I do not know it.*

Earl *Carrington.*

437. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) On the revision of rents is it not the usual practice now to include in rehousing schemes provision for the revision of rents every five years?—That provision has been inserted in several recent schemes, and the Secretary of State would, I think, always insert it if requested.

438. Exemption from the duty of rehousing. Has any communication been made to the Home Office that the London County Council is now proposing to provide accommodation under its General Powers and Part 3 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, for persons displaced by the carrying into effect of the Tower Bridge Southern Approach?—I could not say. I do not remember any, but I will make a note of it and ascertain.†

439. The Board School liability to rehouse has been transferred to the London County Council at the London School Board's expense, with the sanction of the Secretary of State, has it not?—Yes.

440. Would the Home Office have any objection to the London County Council undertaking the same duty for railway companies if they were so requested?—No. (Mr. *Steward.*) I should think not.

441. (To Mr. *Byrne.*) I have only one more question to ask you—that is about the difficulty of rehousing on account of the price of land. Has the Home Office ever been informed by the London County Council that the highest price that they can give for land for rehousing, without putting any charge on the rates, is 10,000*l.* an acre, or 5*s.* per foot?—I do not remember the precise figures, but the County Council have given us certain figures and statements bearing on that point.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

442 (To Mr. *Steward.*) You examine the houses that are about to be pulled down as to their condition, the number of people occupying them, and so forth?—I do not examine the houses; I make enquiries as to the number of people that are living in them, but I take no notice of the house whether it is in good repair, bad repair, or an old bad house or a new house.

443. You do not visit them?—Not personally always. My assistants visit every single house and enquire of the occupants the number of occupants there are in each house.

444. You take the yield of those houses that are in fairly good condition—not the underground rooms you spoke about nor the unsanitary but the fair ordinary houses—as a basis for the rent to be charged for the new accommodation?—I will not say that it is a basis, as being the price

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

on which the other price may be based, but I take it as an element of consideration in fixing the price for the new dwellings.

445. Do you make any recommendation for any increase for this extra expense which you have named connected with the building of the new houses and also the increased price of land; do you make any positive recommendation that in some shape these extra expenses should be added to the original rent?—No, I do not, but I bear it in mind in the general price that I suggest should be charged or that I think the Secretary of State might agree to.

446. Then in the case of St. Pancras (I think it was St. Pancras) it was stated that the new dwellings were charged 2s. 6d. a room while the economic rent, or the competitive rents, was worth about 3s. 6d.?—I believe it was so. It is a case that occurred before my time, but I believe that was so.

447. Then the difference would have to be made up by the railway company?—Yes.

448. That is, the shareholders of the railway company?—Yes.

449. Now perhaps I had better ask the next question of Mr. Byrne—(To Mr. *Byrne*)—Does the same rule apply to the London County Council and the School Board?—We do not fix rents for the local authority; it is only for private industrial companies whose interest of course is opposed to that of the tenants. Representative bodies we consider should not be under such a restriction.

450. That is the point I want to get with regard to representative bodies. You leave them to charge what rent they think proper?—Yes. Might I mention with reference to your last question to Mr. Steward that it was only the statement of the Midland Railway Company that 3s. 6d. was the economic rent for the houses for which the Midland Company may only charge 2s. 6d. That is not in any way admitted by the Home Office; it is *their* statement; but even if it were the fact the Home Office would not think it precisely relevant, because 3*s.* 6*d.* might be obtainable by a railway company or by other landlords in a neighbourhood in practice for their houses, although it would be most improper that they should obtain it, such rentals being only payable by the tenants taking in lodgers and others, and living in a state of overcrowding.

451. My own point was to know whether the same limitation was applied to representative authorities. The deficiency in such a case, of cousre, would have to be paid out of the rates?—Yes.

452. You say that is not so?—No; we fix no rents for local authorities.

453. Do you know of any scheme in which rehousing has not been possible except by the dishousing or displacement of other people of the

	2-room tenements.	3-room tenements.
	s. *d.*	*s.* *d.*
* The rents fixed were—Ground and 1st floor - - -	7 –	9 9
2nd „ - - -	6 6	9 3
3rd „ - - -	6 –	8 9
4th „ - - -	5 6	8 3

An average of nearly 3*s.* 2*d.* per room (W. P. B.)

† I have not been able to ascertain anything about this (W. P. B.)

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

the working classes?—I think it may be said of the rehousing required of the South-Eastern Railway Company in connection with the widening of their line under the Acts of recent years that such of that rehousing as is required in Bermondsey and the immediate neighbouring places must almost necessarily involve displacement of other artisans; it is a densely crowded neighbourhood and it may be doubtful whether there is any place in it where the company could acquire a sufficiently large site without displacing other artisans.

454. Then is it the practise of the Home Office to enforce the rule even though it involves the displacement of others?—Yes; and the recent practise of the Home Office is to consider the additional persons so dishoused in deciding on the number to be provided for.

455. Still, there will remain some dishoused?—Our present policy would be to provide for everyone whether displaced by the operations of the railway company in widening their line, or by the railway company in procuring a site for building blocks of dwellings.

456. That is to say if there is no other site to be obtained they might take a site on which working-class dwellings already exist?—That is so.

457. Then they have still to go a step further and get another site to replace those that have been dishoused in that manner?—Well it would not necessarily mean taking in another site; it would mean providing for a larger number on the site they acquired probably.

458. That is what I wanted to get at. You say the Home Office is always willing and anxious to co-operate with the local authorities. Is it a fact that they have done so frequently with the London County Council, for instance?—Certainly.

459. And that they have found that co-operation very satisfactory?—Certainly.

460. And every desire on the part of the local authorities to meet the wishes of the Home Office as much as they could?—I think so, both in the matter of the Standing Orders, and in the matter of the administration of those Orders when they have become parts of the Act. The London County Council has done undoubtedly excellent service.

461. I did not quite understand your opinion (I will not call it a recommendation) as to the laying of a continuous obligation on railways—the—continuous obligation that if they took houses by private treaty, and so forth—in what way could you get at them except they appeared before Parliament in some way?—They could not be got at in any way except when they came before Parliament; but I have thought that it might be that Parliament would consider it expedient in the case of companies which were often, and necessarily, taking lands in London and displacing artisans, that instead of each new widening or operation they undertook being provided for by a clause in each new Act as it came forward there should, once for all, be a

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

provision of an Act of Parliament saying, for instance: The London and South-Western Railway Company shall provide accommodation for every person of the artisan class whom it dishouses in London, whether under the powers of any Act of Parliament past or any Act in future or otherwise, unless the Secretary of State, for good cause shown, dispenses them from it. Then no other clause would ever be required.

462. In what way would any operation of that kind on the part of a railway company come under the purview—the notice—of the Home Office or any other central authority?—It would have to be accompanied by a requirement that the companies should keep a register of all dwellings occupied by artisans which they acquired in London. That, I think, would be a very reasonable requirement.

463. And that they should give notice to the central authority—the Home Office—whenever they displaced any of the labouring classes anywhere?—Yes.

464. No matter what was the amount of displacement, whether one house or 20?—I think so.

Lord *Wenlock.*

465. May I ask whether you think that that obligation of the register should be retrospective?—Well, that would be a matter for Parliament.

466. I mean what is your own suggestion. I gathered from what you said before that you think it ought to be?—My own suggestion is that it ought not to be retrospective, I should think. The company are placed under obligations by Parliament; they have received powers on certain conditions, and I do not think it would be fair to withdraw any of those powers or to say: You shall only exercise those powers by meeting a further obligation.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

467. Could you tell the Committee, or could you get the information for them, approximately how many people have been rehoused (about how many) under these Standing Orders from the commencement of their operation?—I gave that roughly at the beginning of my evidence.

468. My object in asking this is so that the Committee might have some notion of the nature of the operation they are dealing with; whether it is ten thousand, a hundred thousand, or half a million; and, therefore, I ask you if it is possible to give them some idea of the number that have been rehoused under these Standing Orders, and by the model clauses, since their operation began?—At the beginning of my evidence I gave roughly figures to that effect. I said that if the Committee desired it I would have prepared in the Home Office a complete statement up to the present date; but, of course, the number is changed from day to day.

469. Yes, up-to-date?—The figures I gave went from 1884 to last summer.

Chairman.

470. You said 18,000, I think (was it not) removed, and 12,000 or 13,000 rehoused by the railway companies?—15,000.

Adjourned for a short time.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

471. I will begin with Mr. Steward, if I may. (To Mr. *Steward.*) You stated that you or your assistants visit the houses which it is contemplated to take under the scheme promoted by a railway or some company under a Bill. Now, I understood you to say that enquiries were directed of the tenants as to what the rents were that they paid and the number of persons occupying those premises; what happens if the houses are not inhabited? If the houses are not inhabited, in making up the number of people that I recommend to the Secretary of State as being the number of people to be displaced, I estimate the reasonable number of people that could and would have occupied that house if it had been empty.

472. Do you consult the local authority in that case?—No.

473. You do not?—No, I do it out of my own head.

474. Would not they be very competent, from their thorough local knowledge, to give you information as to the class and character of the people inhabiting those houses?—If you had a large row of houses of a different character to any other in that particular neighbourhood, possibly they would be able to give very useful information; and, at any time, one would be very glad to have information from them.

475. You do not ask for it?—I do not ask for it, and I think it is quite unnecessary. Where you find, as one frequently does, ten or twelve houses in a row and one or two here and there in the row empty—all the same sort of houses—all having the same accommodation—if you get the number of people in the (say) ten houses occupied, you do not want to ask the Borough Council how many people occupied the two houses that are empty; you can assess it very well from those that are occupied.

476. Suppose they are all unoccupied?—I do not think I have ever had a case of that kind.

477. Not in the case lately of the Great Northern and City Railway? Perhaps I may refresh your memory. The Great Northern and City Railway displaced through their works some 150 persons in Poole Street and round there, in New North Road and Shoreditch; they did not put the displacement—the taking of the land—into their Bill, but on the action of the local authority and the action I ventured to take, they have come to an arrangement whereby certain rehousing arrangements are part and parcel of that Bill. Are not you aware of those circumstances at the Home Office?—I do not recollect them. I will look the matter up; I do not think I have any information about that case.

478. Do you find that that provision in the Standing Orders as to the date. I think it is

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

December 31st, is it not?—(Mr. *Byrne.*) The 15th.

479. The words run, I think, practically as follows:—"That in approving a scheme the Secretary of State has to bear in mind the number of persons occupying the houses proposed to be taken on December 15th preceding the powers sought by the Bill," is not that so?—Yes, that is so.

480. Do you find that that date works well, or do you find that there is evasion by getting the people to leave the dwellings the day before that date?—(Mr. *Steward*). I have no reason to believe that that is done.

481. None?—No.

482. You cannot quote any case?—No, I certainly could not.

483. You are satisfied about that?—I am speaking from memory. I cannot recollect any case, and I cannot imagine that it could be in any way worked; if I found a lot of rooms in a house empty, I should bear that in mind in assessing the number of people. I would not be satisfied to take the "return" from a woman who opened the door; after you knock at the door, and ask Who lives here?—the name, and that sort of thing, you would not take her answer as stating the people who lived in that house if there were four vacant rooms upstairs—you would naturally put down in the Schedule the number she gave, and make some allowance for the four vacant rooms.

484. Then I understand that, although there may be a date fixed in the model clause, nevertheless the Secretary of State uses a very wide discretion in his interpretation of that date?—I do not think really "the 15th day of December" comes very much into our consideration.

485. Then mention was made either by you or Mr. Byrne, in your evidence in chief of the case of the South-Eastern Railway Company, as to the arrangement they made with the Guinness Trust. How far did the Home Office, in consenting to that arrangement, bear in mind that the Guinness Trust erected dwellings in that particular district because they were a philanthropic body seeking to remedy the evils arising from over-crowding? In other words, I put it to you, the Guinness Trust would not have erected dwellings in that particular part of London if it had not been that the evils of over-crowding were very acute; and did not the Home Office, in consenting to the South-Eastern Railway Company using these Guinness Trust Buildings, thereby deprive that neighbourhood of the advantages which that Guinness Trust would have given in order to remove the evils of overcrowding?—The Guinness Trust Buildings were approved by the Secretary of State for a temporary rehousing scheme. Of course, what is suggested that it might have taken away from the working classes, especially in Bermondsey, the opportunity of inhabiting the Guinness Trust Buildings for a certain period is no doubt true, but it made no difference upon the liability of the South-Eastern Railway Company to permanently make provision for

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

for rehousing the whole of the people they cleared away.

486. That was under the South-Eastern Act of 1897, was it not?—I think so.

487. That dishoused about a thousand people between London Bridge and Spa Road, and was it not owing to pressure in Parliament and action on the part of the local authority and the Rector of Bermondsey, that the Home Office consented to that arrangement with the Guinness Trustees? (Mr. *Byrne.*) I think Mr. Steward had better let me answer that. It was *not* on account of such pressure. Every detail of the Act at that time had been the result of anxious investigations and enquiry by the Home Office. It is true that Parliamentary action (quite properly) took place in connection with it, and the local authorities had written about it, but the Home Office was not idle.

488. May I then ask, in connection with that particular case (it is a very important point), did you not at the Home Office put the obligation upon the South-Eastern Railway Company to provide dwellings in Abbey Street after buying land there?—That was about the third or fourth proposal.

489. That was early in 1899, was it not?—It was later than that—the Abbey Street site.

490. Acquired early in 1899 by the company?—I do not know when it was acquired.

491. I put it to you that that was the date?—I have no doubt it was. The question of rehousing there did not arise until later. In 1898-99 we were mostly discussing with the company the question of rehousing in the suburbs—on the Hither Green and the other site. The company at that time hoped they would be able to carry out the bulk of their rehousing in the suburbs. Rehousing on the Abbey Street site was taken up when they despaired of rehousing in the suburbs.

492. May I suggest that in any case the Abbey Street site was acquired at least a year ago—I say in 1899, but I suggest that if it is not the date it is at least a year ago?—We have no knowledge of the site having lately been acquired.

493. Are you aware that the other site has been vacant since 1899?—No, I am not.

494. You have had no evidence to that effect from the local authority or local persons?—I do not remember, but I will ascertain and supplement my answer later.

495. I suggest it has been vacant since 1899—that it remains vacant, and that the company has not fulfilled its rehousing obligation or conformed to the orders of the Home Office?—It is true that the rehousing required by that company on that site has not yet been carried out. They have, as a matter of fact, suspended the operations in connection with widening their line.

496. In other words, you have had considerable trouble with the South Eastern Company with regard to its housing operations?—We have had very protracted consideration of different proposals. I would not like to say—in fact, it would not be the truth for me to say—that it was trouble arising from a default or neglect of the company; it was trouble arising from a succession of proposals being made by the company to meet a large rehousing liability, which proposals were considered one after the other and found for one reason or another not to be satisfactory; but the net result has been that the company have not been in default; they have not acquired a large number of houses and then failed to provide the rehousing accommodation that they ought to have provided, but they have simply postponed their operations to a large extent as the widening of the line has not been carried out.

497. Mention was made of the case of Peek, Frean's. In that case the company took a part of the factory of Messrs. Peek, Frean, and Messrs. Peek, Frean took a certain number of workmen's dwellings behind that factory in order to provide for the accommodation which was lost by the compulsory powers given to the railway company; what rehousing has taken place under that particular scheme?—None at present.

498. Though the demolition has actually taken place?—We do not know officially that these demolitions have taken place; even if they had, and had been brought to our knowledge, they would have been entirely outside the Act. Mr. Troup happened to mention that case to show that it was a case in which injury might be done to the working classes which was not met by the Act.

499. Mr. Steward mentioned that though he had no information about it officially, nevertheless he was satisfied that the persons displaced under the schemes we have discussed to-day practically never inhabited the new houses provided?—(Mr. *Steward.*) I am told that the bulk of the people do not go into the new houses. It is hearsay evidence; it is what I am told by the County Council and also by some of the company's representatives.

500. Quite so; but you do not make any study of that point at the Home Office?—No, not at all.

501. Though there is plenty of official information available—for instance, the displacement under the London County Council—in the case of the Boundary Street scheme, there many thousands were displaced and a few hundreds only returned?—I believe even less than that by the County Council's statement; I have seen it in their book.

502. The Home Office takes no account of that point?—No.

503. When did the Home Office first become impressed with the gravity of this question of dishousing on the part of companies and others seeking Parliamentary powers under private Bills? I gathered from Mr. Byrne that he could give figures running from the year 1884 to 1901?—(Mr. *Byrne.*) Yes.

504. Did the Home Office become impressed with the importance of this subject of its own accord, or was it by representations made by local authorities or otherwise?—Naturally, the most important factor in causing increased attention and action on the part of the office was the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1884-89, which made the fundamental change in the Standing Orders that Mr. Troup explained. The administrative action of the Home Office depends entirely upon the provisions contained in

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

in the clauses in the Acts of Parliament; consequently unless there is any change in those clauses the Home Office do not come in .

505. Have the local authorities made constant representations in recent years upon these matters?—In recent years they have made an increasing number of representations; they are always welcomed—always considered—and have frequently been useful.

506. In your evidence to-day you said that roughly the figures were some 12,000 rehoused and some 18,000 dishoused?—Yes, 18,000 dishoused and 15,000 rehoused, I think.

507. Do those figures in any way represent in the mind of the Home Office the magnitude and gravity of this subject?—Not at all. The operations of railway companies which diminish the accommodation of the working classes are probably slight compared with the natural progress of industrial changes in certain districts. The Home Office do not consider that the effect of the operations of the railway companies on the housing of the working classes is of the very first importance in the question. I meant that they do not—I forget the words Mr. Hay used.

508. Shall I repeat the question?—If you will.

509. The question I put is this:—Whether the number of persons dishoused and rehoused represents in the opinion of the Home Office the gravity and importance of the subject?—No; the number of persons dishoused by the natural process of the building of factories and other industrial buildings where previously were residences, is probably so great that the operations of railway companies are not the most important factor; but we have no definite statistics on that matter.

510. You have not?—No.

511. Has it not been at all under your consideration that in the year 1900, out of a total number of 218 private Acts passed in that Session 120 contained a section providing for the rehousing of the working classes displaced under those Acts?—I have a list of the Acts which have been passed, and am prepared to accept the number.

512. You do not challenge the correctness of my figures upon that point?—No.

513. How do these schemes under private Bills relating to dishousing and rehousing compare, according to the Parliamentary Return dated 2nd August, 1900, as to the number of schemes either authorised or in course of completion, or in respect to which no proceedings have been taken under public statutes. You are not aware of the figures?—I am not aware of the figures. The explanation of the difference is, I think, obvious. Of all the companies which receive powers from Parliament to take dwellings, the proportion who, in the first instance, actually proceed with the work at all is small.

514. Under private Acts?—Under private, local, and personal Acts; the proportion who take dwellings is still smaller; the proportion who take dwellings reaching the number of twenty, which alone brings them into the cognisance of the Home Office, is extremely small; therefore it is not to me at all surprising that there should be 100 or 200 Acts of Parliament on the face of them empowering the acquisition of property, and not ten schemes under the model clause.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

515. How do you reconcile that statement with the return issued on the 20th February, 1902, by the London County Council, in which the following figures are set forth: The various private Bills introduced into Parliament in the present Session and directly affecting London, are sixty in number; in these Bills there are works authorised which involve the displacement of the working classes; that under them the total number of persons to be displaced will amount to 20,555 persons, including forty-three displaced by the Home Office, and 1,634 by the London County Council?—I presume that means the number of persons who might be displaced if those Bills all passed Parliament—all were proceeded with by their promoters, and all actually carried out the displacements contemplated.

516. Then you rather suggest in that respect that a number of these Bills will not involve, if that become law, the displacement spoken of here?—That is so certainly. I might illustrate that by mentioning that a company in preparing its schedule of persons to be displaced, for deposit in the preparation of the Bill, has to put down a whole row of houses possibly in which only a small portion of the back gardens is to be taken. These houses have to appear in the Schedule, and it may turn out that not a single person will be displaced even if the widening (or whatever it may be) is carried out.

517. I will mention the headings of this return: Electric railway companies will displace 13,000 persons, those are new Bills this Session; Bills suspended last Session, 4,000; other railway companies, 1,300; tramway companies, 188; gas companies, 37. Do you mean to tell the Committee that the question is not serious—because though these particular Bills may not pass, the electric traction which is in contemplation throughout the metropolis must inevitably have a very serious influence on the question of rehousing and overcrowding, must it not?—The question is undoubtedly serious, but the number of Bills which are presented in any Session of Parliament empowering—or proposing to empower—companies to dishouse members of the working classes has really nothing to do with the number of persons who may eventually come to be rehoused; for instance, these electrical Bills have to a very large extent been dropped—some of them; there are other Bills relating to traffic which burrow so deep underground as to be beyond the reach of even the most modern Standing Order, and in other ways.

518. I mentioned the case of the Great Northern and City; that burrows deep?—I understand Mr. Troup is going to give evidence upon that point.

519. The question I submit is this: Is it a fact that the Home Office are impressed with the fact that the displacement by promoters of private Bills is daily increasing in its importance?—Yes; it is.

520. What is your opinion as to whether this limit of 25 years should be extended?—I think, as I have said in reference to another matter, that recent legislation empowering the Borough Councils of London to keep an eye on and to provide sufficient accommodation for artisans within their districts, makes the question of compara-

time

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

tive unimportance—the responsibility will in future to a large extent be theirs.

521. You would, in other words, recommend that that period should be extended?—Personally I do not see any grave necessity for it, for that reason.

522. Are dwellings always ready for occupation before displacement occurs?—In my evidence in chief I mentioned two exceptions to the general rule, that they ought to be, and are.

523. Do you mean to say there are only two exceptions in your experience?—Two classes of exception—namely, those in which the Secretary of State has authorised it, because temporary accommodation has been provided, or the existence of vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood has been satisfactorily proved, and the two or three occasions on which, on a very small scale, he allowed it without such accommodation being provided on account of grave necessity.

523*. But you could not tell me, in reply to the earlier part of my question, as to how it is that in the South-Eastern case, which we were discussing, there is vacant land; displacement has taken place, and no rehousing has been effected—no adequate rehousing?—I understand that it is asserted that the Abbey Street site has not only been bought, but the houses all demolished.

524. The land is still vacant?—That site was not acquired by the company under the powers of any Act, so that even if they have demolished all the buildings on it it is quite beyond the scope and power of the Home Office.

525. But the Abbey Street site forms part of the scheme?—It was suggested as a scheme for rehousing, but it was acquired—if acquired at all—by the company by voluntary purchase, not within the powers of the Act.

526. That is not my point—my point is this: That would form part of the rehousing scheme?—No; it was a suggestion made in the middle of the negotiations about that scheme; the Secretary of State said he would approve it as a site, but the company never pursued the matter.

527. They never then pursued the matter?—They never pursued the matter; the scheme is not made yet.

528. The scheme is neither made, nor the rehousing of the people completed?—No.

529. But displacement has taken place, nevertheless?—No: the displacement authorised by the Act—which is the only displacement that the Secretary of State has power to provide for—has not taken place. The whole operations of the company have been suspended. If it be the case that the company has voluntarily bought the Abbey Street site and demolished the buildings upon it, it is an operation quite beyond the jurisdiction of the Home Office.

530. Do not you think it is a great disadvantage to the Home Office in dealing with this question of housing in respect of railways—that they have no other control over railways—that they cannot make any arrangement as to housing schemes outside the area over which the Home Office has control?—The difficulty has not practically arisen. With regard to suburban housing, the Home Office has professed itself

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

willing to sanction a scheme involving the provision of dwelling accommodation in the suburbs, and the provision of workmen's cheap trains to bring the dwellers therein to and fro. None have been carried into practical effect, because the proposals came from the South-Eastern Company, and we understood from the South-Eastern that the congestion of their line was so great that although most anxious to do so in their own interests, they were positively unable to put an extra workmen's train on in the morning; so that it was not because the Home Office thought it undesirable, but because the company themselves said they were unable to carry it out, that the scheme dropped.

531. Practically the thing is at a deadlock, then, in regard to that?—In regard to that matter, yes.

532. And the Home Office has no other legal power in the matter?—No; the Home Office only come in when the company begin to acquire in contravention of the Act.

533. Did I understand you correctly in your evidence in chief to say that it was comparatively rare in private Bills to find clauses seeking compulsory powers to acquire land?—For rehousing.

534. Comparatively rare?—I think so; I think there are only two or three cases; I could give the total number.

535. Not only in the case of railway companies, but in the case of all other companies over whom you have no jurisdiction in this matter, do you ascribe that to the fact that evasion often takes place?—No; I should not say that. I think the companies are divided into two classes, in this way—the companies which are experienced in rehousing—who have had previous experience of it, and know what they have had to do—such as the South-Eastern, the South-Western, and others; and new companies who really do not know, and who sometimes come to the Home Office and make it clear that they have not realised or contemplated under what a serious liability they have come.

536. You do not suggest that the London and North-Western is a new company?—No.

537. What category do you put that into?—Among the companies that have had sufficient experience to enable them to carry out their obligations at once.

538. Then that being so, I would wish particularly to ask you about a matter on which I sought information and have not been able to get a reply. I understand it is held by the authorities of the Home Office that no statutory company is entitled to own lands without express statutory authority?—If I may say so, I understand Mr. Troup to have said that a certain Standing Order was based on that supposition; but he declined to say whether as a proposition of law that was right or not.

539. It has never been decided?—I am not aware that it has.

540. But the Home Secretary proceeds upon the assumption that the law is that a statutory company can only own land by express statutory power?—We have proceeded on that as a working hypothesis, but cases have occurred which have made us doubt it.

541. If that be so I should like to know under what

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

what powers the London and North Western Railway Company have acquired the properties the names of which I will put in now: In Park Village East—they have scheduled a number of houses in Park Village East, and they have carried out clearances as to which I have been unable to find any express power—in Augusta Street, Stanhope Street, Granby Street, and so forth?—May I ask if those are cases in which communications have taken place with the Home Office?

542. I addressed a letter to the Home Secretary on the subject on the 14th April of this year?—All I can say is I do not remember the circumstance of that letter; but when I return to the office I will find out immediately and give an answer to the Committee.

543. Can you answer this: Have those houses been closed or demolished?—No, I do not remember the letter at all at the present moment.*

Chairman.

544. You will put in a correct answer to that question, will you?—Certainly, my Lord.

545. You had better add it to your evidence as given, when you have the facts before you. That is the best plan?—Yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

546. As to the question of rents. Is it not a fact that the matter has been one of considerable difficulty at the Home Office?—Not until recently.

547. When was the first difficulty—how did it arise?—I never remember any serious discussion or difficulty on the subject of rents until the appeal for the modification of the rents was made by the Midland Railway Company (which I summarised this morning) in 1896; nor do I remember any difficulty about the amount of rents to be fixed until the last two or three years, in which there has been a good deal of correspondence between the Secretary of State, the Lambeth Borough Council, and the South Western Railway Company with regard to their dwellings in Lambeth; so that it is quite a recent question so far as my experience goes.

548. Was not one of the points this, that practically they claimed that they should be able to ask a higher rent of those persons who were not persons displaced by their schemes, but who occupied those houses that the company had erected under the housing scheme?—That was one of the definite requests in the case of the Midland.

549. Would it not very easily become this, that the company could engineer tenants who were dishoused tenants (you understand me) out of these dwellings—even giving them a premium to go?—Yes, certainly.

550. And then be able to put up the rents to persons who were not dishoused persons?—Certainly; that is a consideration the Home Office has been alive to.

551. Very much alive to?—Yes.

552. Do you suggest that the clause ought to be further strengthened to give you further power as regards that?—If the result of the pending legal proceeding—which will probably settle the question of jurisdiction as to rent—

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

should be unfavourable to the Home Office contention—that full power exists with the Secretary of State—then I am sure the Home Secretary will recommend Parliament to grant him the powers definitely.

553. In effect the Home Office claims to be, in practice, a "fair rent" court?—Yes, with regard to this extremely limited class of dwellings.

554. Will you recite the circumstances under which the writ was issued last year against the London and North Western Railway on the 19th April, 1901, claiming 16,000*l.* damages under the housing scheme. It was a question of rents, was it not?—The question of rents was raised, but the legal proceedings which are taking place are nominally and expressly against the company for default in having acquired houses without obtaining approval to a scheme. It is true that part of the delay which took place in their procuring approval to the scheme arose from their unwillingness to allow that the Secretary of State had power over rents; but the action against them is for default in having acquired dwellings without having had the scheme approved; and it is doubtful whether the question of rents can arise in this matter.

555. Those proceedings have now been going on for more than a year?—For a very long time—a great deal more than a year.

556. And in the meantime the Secretary of State is not able to clear up points of doubt in other similar cases?—No other company has raised the contention about the rents. The action of the London and North Western has not hitherto been followed by any other company.

557. Do not you think a new clause, or some amending of the present model clause, might remove the necessity for legal proceedings?—I do not think any clearing up of the law with regard to rents would make the Secretary of State withdraw from his present proceeding—the default of the company being manifest.

558. In the question of rents, I suppose the general rise in rents throughout London owing to the congestion of the population has had some bearing upon the decision of the Home Office in fixing those rents—that is to say, the Home Office has been inclined perhaps to sanction higher rents than it would have sanctioned if there had not been the existing circumstance of congestion of population?—I think that is undoubtedly true. As a matter of fact, the rents recently fixed have—sometimes in a trifling, sometimes in a substantial degree—exceeded the rents that used to be fixed 20 years ago.

559. In other words, the Home Office has joined in the general rise in rents?—To a reasonable degree, I should think.

560. You could not give me the difference in rents, could you, in the particular case in the district to which you alluded in your evidence-in-chief, between the years 1892 and 1896 and to-day?—We have not had a recent case of rehousing there.

561. The rents up there, of course, have been very materially affected by the congestion of population through the displacements and clearances caused by the Great Northern and City Railway Companies?—Yes.

562. In

* *See* Appendix for a statement of the facts of this case.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

562. In other words, it is a terrible state of congestion?—I can quite believe that.

563. The same remark applies to Lambeth?—To Lambeth. I know it to be the case there, because we have had a recent case in Lambeth.

Lord *Lamington.*

564. Do you mean congestion caused by the dishousing?—Yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

565. For the information of the Committee, would you shortly recite the Broad Street case, which led practically to the appointment of this Committee?—I have a note of it here, but I understood that Mr. Troup was going to give evidence upon that point, because it relates more to the Standing Order than to administration.

566. In administration do you find that the effect of this 20 house limit is to confine the action and the efficacy of the Department?—There are cases in which a substantial number of houses are taken, and yet not 20.

567. In other words, do you find that the School Board for London practice is followed—that is to say, taking, say, nine in one year and eleven in another, so as to bring it under 20?—I do not think it is often, because there are no public bodies which want to take property repeatedly like that. As a rule, when railway companies want to take property they have to take it on a substantial scale, and it is not worth their while to spread it over a number of years. I do not know of any similar case in which that action of the London School Board has been adopted.

568. Do not you think if you had more communication with the local authorities you would come to know more of such cases?—That means, do I believe that such cases exist without our knowing them.

569. Yes?—I really have no reason to think so.

570. In your evidence-in-chief, and, I think, on subsequent cross-examination, you referred to the attitude of the Home Office towards the local authorities; and though you said you welcomed the notion of local authorities being apprised of a scheme when the scheme was being submitted to the Home Office, you did not favour the notion that the local authorities by right should simultaneously be aware—in other words, from the very beginning—of the proposed displacement, and the scheme which was to be approved in connection with that displacement?—No. I wished to say that I was in favour of the scheme being submitted to the local authority for any observations they might wish to make at the earliest possible stage. The only reservation I made was that I did not think their formal approval should be required.

Chairman.

571. You gave reasons; I think you stated them at length, did you not?—Yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

572. Is it not a fact that in various Acts already in existence special power has been given to local authorities in this matter?—Yes, in recent years.

573. If it has been given in some cases, why should it not be given in all?—It has never been given to *approve*—only to have it submitted to them.

574. What I am anxious to get from you is this—whether it is not of vital importance that these local authorities should know the details of the scheme as early as (if not even before) the Home Office. They have got local knowledge which the Home Office cannot claim to possess, and they could very often make suggestions which would not only expedite the scheme, but which would show an apparently innocent scheme proposed by a railway company to have various pitfalls in the public interest?—Yes, the Home Office would agree with that—that it is expedient that local authorities should receive from the company such information as to their proposals, and at such an early date as would enable them to make effective representations to the Secretary of State.

575. Then, does the Home Office in connection with these schemes consider the effect of this displacement upon the rateable value of the district?—That does not come within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State.

576. Or equalisation of rates—the relief in respect of which to a poor district depends upon the population within the borough?—That does not come within the purview of the Home Office.

577. Is it not desirable that you should have specific direction upon that point?—That the Secretary of State, for instance, should have power to impose a burden upon the company until the scheme is carried out, do you mean?

578. No, my point is this: It has a very great bearing on the Broad Street case—there you have a very poor district?—Yes.

579. Which receives relief under the Equalisation of Rates Act on the basis of its population. By your railway and other displacements you reduce that population, and therefore you drive the rates higher on the population which remains?—Yes.

580. Now, surely if you are going to penalise companies at all by displacement, that very material fact ought to weigh in any scheme in cash or rehousing to be made?—That is quite beyond my official experience. I have no doubt it is a proper matter for Parliament.

581. You acknowledge that it must be of importance?—Personally, I should think it proper to be considered by Parliament, but quite beyond my official duties.

582. You have no power or instructions under that point?—No. There is the point, of course, that under the Housing of the Working Classes Act the local authority carrying out the scheme has to make good out of the rates the loss which occurs before the new dwellings are erected; there is no such obligation on the railway company under this clause; but that is entirely a matter for Parliament; the Home Office has never had to consider it.

583. The Home Office in dealing with this matter of housing under these Bills recognises that the local authority is a local authority for health purposes under the Public Health Act; does it consult the local authority as to the effect on the Public Health Act which displacement might have by creating overcrowding?—No.

584. Then

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

584. Then in the case of Broad Street—I asked you to recount the facts; and I should like you in doing that to kindly state how you think that the purchase and the closing of these model dwellings would affect the overcrowded district from a sanitary point of view and a rate point of view?—Mr. Troup will give evidence on that.

Mr. *Crean.*

585. Will you give me some idea as to the reasons why the Home Office required the railway companies to provide accommodation for 15,000 people when they displaced by the destruction of the houses 18,000?—The reasons are various, of course, differing in each case; the difference of 3,000 does not arise all on one head.

586. What are the general reasons?—The general reasons would be that in some of the cases a large amount of vacant accommodation existed in the neighbourhood already, and therefore the company would not be called upon to rehouse as many as they had displaced, the Secretary of State having full discretion.

587. As you assume the right to reduce the number of houses required to accommodate the people displaced, do you assume equally the right to increase the number if necessary?—No, the Home Office has never called on a company to rehouse more than it has displaced; companies have occasionally done so in order to meet contingent future liabilities of their own.

588. Such as increased employment being given in the district?—Yes, or because by a future Act of Parliament they propose to take more houses in the neighbourhood.

589. For future extensions?—Yes.

590. Do you think the Home Office has the power of increasing the number as well as diminishing the number, because the order does not provide for diminishing at all?—No.

591. Do you suppose that the Home Office has the power to fix the number?—That would appear to be so; the terms of the Act appear not to be limited at all.

592. In considering the accommodation to be provided by the companies does the Home Office ever consider the increase in the population consequent on the warehouses or workshops that may be erected by the companies?—Certainly. In considering whether the company must rehouse everyone whom it displaces the first consideration present to the mind of the Home Office is: In what sort of a district does this displacement take place? If it is in a crowded district like Bermondsey the Home Office would not even consider the question of reducing the number except for some very unusual and unlikely reason; whereas up in the North of London—the St. John's Wood district or something like that—it might be *primâ facie* desirable.

593. You made a statement in reference to the companies applying for permission to remove the accommodation to some other district in consequence of the cost of the site?—Yes.

594. Did you ever give permission under the circumstances?—No permission has been carried into practical effect, but the Secretary of State has on two occasions at least told a company that he would approve a scheme involving a suburban

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

housing upon increased means of communication being afforded.

595. Did he, before giving such a permission, make an investigation, or cause investigation to be made by the Department, as the statements were only verbal statements, as to the accuracy of the statements made in those cases?—As to the difficulty of getting accommodation?

596. Yes?—In both the cases I remember the allegation of difficulty was made. With regard to Bermondsey, the Secretary of State's knowledge as to the overcrowding of that district was so full, and came from such varied and well-informed sources, that there was no occasion for such inquiry.

597. As to the overcrowding, that might be so; but I mean as to the cost of the site?—The Secretary of State has never had to allow any remission to a company on account of the cost of a site; he has not therefore had occasion to advert to it particularly. I only mentioned the case of site as a matter which the companies represented to the Secretary of State; it is not a matter which concerns his action at all.

598. Do you ever get a list of the tenants displaced?—Nearly always, with particulars of their families and their occupations.

599. Then you are able under the circumstances to ascertain the number of old tenants reinstated?—Yes, we generally know that; we do not make a point of ascertaining it, but we know it indirectly in various ways.

600. It would be necessary to obtain that information for the purpose of fixing a rent, would it not?—If this Committee should recommend it, the Home Office could, without any difficulty, make it the rule to require such a return from the railway companies; we have not done so in the past.

601. In the fixing of those rents a statement was made by your colleague here that he generally took into consideration the cost of the site?—I did not understand that he said so.

602. (To Mr. *Steward.*) When you were cross-examined I took down the statement that you generally take into consideration in fixing the new rents for the new homes the cost of the site itself?—The cost of the site.

603. The cost of the site. Yes; I think I am correct in my statement, because I took it down myself?—I could not have stated that.

Chairman.

604. Then if you did say so, you did not mean to say so?—No.

Mr. *Crean.*

605. Do you know of any cases of railway companies wanting possession and acquiring property that they had no Act of Parliament for?—(Mr. *Byrne.*) No; my own impression—I give it you for what it is worth—is that railway companies can only acquire land in pursuance of powers given to them by an Act of Parliament, but I do know that in practice railway companies often have concealed in ancient Acts of Parliament a general power to take up to 10 or even 20 acres of land for the purposes of their undertaking; and occasionally they have mentioned such ancient powers as these to us as the authority

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

authority under which they have quite recently bought land.

606. Could you generally tell me what guides the Home Office in fixing the rent—the general circumstance which guides them?—Mr. Steward has explained the inquiries which he makes, the result of which he lays before the Home Office. The Home Secretary then considers Mr. Steward's recommendation, and the facts in support of it. He considers the representations made generally by the company, and also gives most careful consideration to the representations made to him by the borough council or other local authority if any such has communicated with him. In recent cases in London some of the councils have always communicated with him in great detail. The Secretary of State then considers the class of artisans who are going to occupy these houses; and in one case in which that question was raised I may mention that he had before him full statistics obtained from the Board of Trade as to the remuneration of those artisans, and as to the rise in their remuneration in recent years, and so forth. Then acting as a purely discretionary authority, and taking all these considerations together, he fixes a scale of rentals which appears to him to be fair in view of all the interests.

607. Then, generally speaking, your office takes into consideration the new accommodation that is provided for the people—the improved accommodation?—Yes.

608. And equally so the power of the tenant to pay extra for that?—Yes.

Sir *John Tuke.*

609. I merely wish to ask if you can say whether you are aware of any cases in which there is a marked discrepancy between the commercial value of the land acquired and its value as a housing site?—That is a question which is constantly being brought to the knowledge of the Home Office, not only in connection with these enactments, but especially in connection with the Housing of the Working Classes Acts; it is a fact familiar to the Home Office.

610. Does it occur in the case of railways frequently?—I should think it must necessarily do so.

611. And also in connection with schemes of the County Council?—Certainly; it comes more prominently before us in connection with schemes of the County Council.

612. Can you give any figures?—Perhaps it would be more becoming for the figures on that subject to be given by a representative of the County Council. The figures are familiar to the County Council; they are compiled in their annual books and excellently set forth in a summary which they have in print.

613. Does this discrepancy (which I am informed is very considerable) come into computation as to the rents allowed by the Home Office in any way?—The Home Office, speaking generally, does not consider the loss to the railway company which will arise from the rate at which it fixes rents; it takes the view that the company gets its profit by the facilities which the Act gives it—not by the interest which it obtains in the shape of rent.

Lord *Lamington.*

614. Do you think the Home Office should, in the public interest, fix the rents, not in the case of those who have actually been dishoused, but in the case of those who would be new tenants. Do you think that is in the public interest?—Yes; for the reason that the object which is now aimed at by the Standing Orders is not so much the rehousing of the persons actually displaced as to keep up the stock of accommodation for that class of persons in the particular neighbourhood of London in which the dishousing takes place.

615. Have those tenants the power to sub-let?—The regulations of the buildings do not come under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State.

616. In the case of a man who could afford to pay a higher rent, might he not get one of these rooms at a cheap rent and at once let it to somebody else?—That cannot happen in the case of the dwellings erected by the County Council.

617. I mean in the case of railway companies, and generally?—I do not think so.

618. Why not?—I do not think a railway company would allow sub-letting.

619. Why not?—Simply on the ground that if it was brought to the knowledge of the Secretary of State it would be regarded as an infraction of the rule relating to rents.

620. Then you believe that the Secretary of State is wiser than the whole of the public. You think that he knows better than the public do themselves?—As to what rent ought to be paid?

621. Yes?—No; I do not think the Secretary of State looks upon it as "wisdom" on his part, but as a very serious burden imposed upon him by Parliament.

622. The Home Office, in your opinion, are really wiser than the public as to what is the value?—They have to do their best to give practical effect to an enactment, constantly approved by Parliament, which imposes—and is intended to impose—a serious liability on railway companies. The Secretary of State would not consider that he was giving effect to that enactment if he allowed a company to erect buildings in lieu of those pulled down, and charge what rentals they liked, because it is highly probable that such buildings would, for commercial reasons, be let at rentals which would put them entirely beyond the reach of artisans.

623. In theory?—Yes.

624. In theory only?—And we know that in practice it would be so.

625. I suppose those buildings could be let at the price that people are willing to pay?—That is so. The rent would be higher than that at which they are now let; in other words, the stock of accommodation for people who could only pay the lower rent would practically be diminished. If the Secretary of State were to raise his hand at the present moment and say, "I withdraw the stipulation as to the rent of dwellings erected by railway companies," the accommodation for the poorer artisans would be reduced by, probably, the total number of houses provided.

626. Then, you do not believe in "commercial value"?—The instruction of Parliament to the Secretary of State is to disregard it, we hold.

Lord *Lamington*—continued.

627. Then, as the railways lose by this, they must recoup themselves somehow?—Yes.

628. And do not they have to do it by raising their rates? They are not going to lose in the end if they can possibly avoid it; therefore, the public, you will admit, probably suffer in other ways?—Oh, no. May I suggest that the companies obviously get more than an equivalent for the loss which they sustain by having to build and to maintain these dwellings in the increased facilities which they get under the compulsory powers which are given to them. If the companies did not think they were making a good bargain they would not continue their extensions and widenings.

629. They are almost forced to, are they not? I should think you might say that they are almost obliged to in these days? It is not a question of doing something by which they are actually to get an increased profit at all. They are under Act of Parliament obligation to carry people. If these other obligations are not imposed by Act of Parliament they are practically imposed by public requirement; therefore, they do not necessarily, I take it, get an increased profit?—I think railway companies still find it possible to postpone improvements.

630. Yes, possibly they do. In reply to Mr. Hay, you talked about St. Pancras being congested owing to these operations?—Yes.

631. By "congestion" I suppose you mean that people are overcrowding, and therefore the houses become insanitary. Is that how you would define "congestion"?—Personally, I should think that congestion might arise even before the stage of a breach of the sanitary laws was arrived at. I think you might fairly describe a district as "congested" if it was very crowded, but still not in such a condition as to bring it within the bye-laws of the local authority; that is to say, if many single-roomed tenements included lodgers —in other words, if there was sub-letting?

632. I see what you mean?—For instance, sanitary bye-laws, as a rule, prescribe that a certain amount of cubic space shall be allowed to each person. I should think a district might be congested even before that limit was reached.

633. Could the sanitary authorities interpose under such circumstances?—The sanitary authorities have to enforce a public Act and their own bye-laws; they have no power to go beyond that.

634. Probably the district would not be congested if the bye-laws were properly carried out. Have not they the power to prevent this overcrowding to the extent you talk about?—Yes; the Home Office has no sanitary jurisdiction at all.

635. The local authorities have, have they not? —Speaking just as an outsider, I presume that if the sanitary laws are carried out there will be no congestion or overcrowding, but I have no official knowledge on that point at all.

636. When you talk of "congestion" it is rather vague. You are talking in a general sense of people living "thick" in a district?—It is quite vague, yes When I was speaking of congestion in connection with Bermondsey I spoke of it in the stricter sense, as meaning that the sanitary laws were not carried out there. There was extreme overcrowding, and some of the people actually camped out in the streets in the case to which I referred.

Lord *Lamington*—continued.

637-8. In St. Pancras?—No, in Bermondsey.

639. I think it was Mr. Steward who said there were tremendous fluctuations of people always going on, particularly in London. As I understand, you do not think this question of overcrowding could be met by the voluntary act of the people going to other districts less crowded. They do not always live near their work?—I do not quite follow.

640. I will put it in this way: You think that when a man settles down in a district in London he remains there practically always, unless some very good cause arises to induce him to go elsewhere?—I do not think that is necessarily so, but whether it is so or not, I think there are districts in London in which any increase of overcrowding caused by the operations of railway companies ought to be in the public interest strictly looked after—that is to say, I do not think that the voluntary efforts of the residents would fully take the place of such enactments as these model clauses.

641. Not even in view of your knowledge of the tremendous way in which people move about in London quite voluntarily—of their own accord?—No.

Chairman.

642. Now, I just want to ask you one question with regard to rent. In fixing the rent for these new houses, do you ever take into consideration at all the rents that used to be paid by the persons who were displaced in their former houses?—Yes, my Lord; that always forms part of Mr. Steward's report to the Home Office, and is carefully considered.

643. Then, is it regarded as essential in fixing the amount of the new rent; is it one of the leading factors?—Yes, my Lord. It is considered an important element, but not a conclusive element, because sometimes the tenants pay high rents simply because in private houses they can sublet and they would not be allowed to do so in improved dwellings.

644. Is there anything further you wish to say to the Committee?—I might ask just this general question: You have been speaking a great deal about railway companies. Is it your experience that the railway companies have, on the whole, tried to fulfil their obligations fairly or otherwise?—Speaking generally, my Lord, and admitting one or two exceptions, I am instructed to say that it is the view of the Home Office that the railway companies do try loyally, and as rapidly as circumstances admit of, to give effect to these Acts of Parliament. Making allowance for the great difficulties they encounter, it is thought that they meet the heavy obligations imposed upon them in a highly creditable manner.

The witnesses are directed to withdraw.

14 *May* 1902.

MR. C. E. TROUP, C.B., is again called in; and further Examined.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

645. Does the Home Office dishouse any appreciable number of persons in connection with the building of police stations and county courts?—No, I do not think so. We are under the same obligations as companies if anything of the sort takes place. So far as I am aware, there has been no case.

646. Was not there a case which formed the subject of a question on March 7th, 1901, in respect of a new police building in Shepherdess Walk, City Road?—I am not aware of the case; but certainly if we had taken more than 20 houses we should have been under the same obligation to rehouse as any company. I have no knowledge of that particular case.

647. The point is this: It was in a very overcrowded area and contiguous to certain property which had been acquired by railways and others, consequently it raised the question of housing in an acute form. Do you think that the Home Office should come under obligations of a more stringent character in a case of that sort?—I do not think it should be under any more stringent obligation than other people.

648. Then as regards the number of houses—the 20 houses limitation—do you think that ought to be reduced?—That is a question, I think, for the Committee.

649. I mean, taking your experience of the Department of the Home Office, would you say it would be a valuable improvement to reduce the number of houses?—Speaking for myself personally—not for the Department—I think the limit of 20 seems to be a high one.

650. Ten you think would be better?—I think so.

651. Then as regards the area. At present, I think you told the Committee the other day, the area in which 20 houses had to be taken in the Metropolitan boroughs must be in one borough. In the Metropolitan boroughs it may happen that one side of the road or street is in one borough and the other side in another, and if nine houses are taken in one borough and eleven in the other the company has no rehousing obligation?—Yes, that is so.

652. You hold that the area should be better defined, and that the obligation of the company should not be evaded by an accidental line of demarcation such as that?—I think you must have some fixed local area; I think it is quite a fair question for consideration whether it ought not rather to be the whole of London than any particular borough; but I am not prepared to make any recommendation upon the subject. I have no strong opinion upon the subject.

653. Do you think the electric light companies, and the like, will appreciably affect this question by displacement?—I think it is quite possible that in some cases they may want to displace more than 20 houses.

654. Omnibus companies have not come into this, have they?—I have never heard of omnibus companies coming into it.

655. Because they do not come to Parliament?—Because they do not come to Parliament for powers.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

656. Have you any information to show the displacement occasioned by omnibus companies?—I have no information upon that.

657. Could you get any, do you think?—No, I do not see how we could get at it.

658. Tramway companies?—These clauses sometimes occur in tramway Bills. I do not think there ever has been any case where they have exceeded the limit of 20 houses.

659. Do you think that difficulties arise, or are likely to arise, from the fact that the Home Office is in charge of this business within the London area and the Local Government Board outside London?—No, I do not think any difficulty has ever arisen.

660. Not?—No.

661. Is not it very objectionable that upon a question of administration there should be one foot in one office and another foot in another?—Well, it is rather illogical, but in this case it has not given rise to any practical difficulty.

662. Never?—No; I have never known any difficulty arise.

663. How did it come to pass that the Home Office became the authority that acts in London?—At the time when the Standing Orders were originally made the Home Office had a great deal of jurisdiction in London in other matters, which in the country was exercised by the Local Government Board. Of course, that has changed a good deal now, under the Local Government Act and under the London Government Act. The Local Government Board have now jurisdiction in many matters in London which they had not at the time when these Standing Orders were passed.

664. Do not you think the question would be better handled if the Home Office could have some greater say in regard to other departments of railway work. The Board of Trade, for example, controls the question of workmen's trains, the question of fares and so forth, and these have such a great bearing on any rehousing scheme?—I should have thought, if it were desirable to make the running of additional trains part of a scheme, it would be within the power of the Secretary of State to do it.

665. You think he has that power?—That was certainly provided for in the South Eastern Bill of 1900—it was expressly provided for there; but I think as the Secretary of State can impose any conditions on his sanction of a scheme it is possible that, even without an express provision upon the subject, he might do it.

666. Have you read the document I gave you as regards the Great Northern and City?—Yes.

667. The arrangement there made is simply that the Great Northern and City Railway Company have agreed with the Shoreditch Borough Council that, in consideration of the railway company having taken, through their contractor, certain lands within the Borough of Shoreditch, and displaced therefrom some 153 persons of the labouring class, the company shall give 1,000*l.* to the local authority; which would enable the local authority (if they see fit) to buy land at the end of the Great Northern and City Railway Company's system whereon to build

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

build working-class dwellings, which will house a far larger number than they could house if they had to buy lands in Shoreditch itself. Do not you think that that arrangement is a practical and useful way, and an economical way of dealing with the question of dishousing, rehousing, and overcrowding?—Well, I think it is fair point to bring before the Committee that that is a way in which it might be done; and in favour of that there is certainly the fact referred to by Mr. Byrne, that the Metropolitan Borough Councils have now themselves independent powers of rehousing under Part 3 of the Act of 1890. At the same time, I think the proposal wants a great deal of consideration, and that some very strict conditions would probably have to be laid down as to the way in which any such money should be applied, and that it would be a very difficult matter in any general scheme to estimate what the amount of the payment would be.

668. Has the London County Council ever suggested that instead of the railway companies being charged with the rehousing on these vacant spaces under a scheme approved by the Secretary of State, certain cash should be paid to them, and that they should carry out the rehousing instead of the railway company?—I believe such a suggestion has been made, but it has not come before me in any way.

669. Not officially?—No; not officially.

670. Then do not you think that to a considerable degree the railway and similar companies are penalised by the Standing Orders—the model clauses—as they now stand?—Are penalised by them?

671. Yes?—I think they impose upon the railway companies a considerable burden.

672. Do you think them in any way restricting?—The cost of rehousing must always be one item to be taken into consideration by a company in considering whether they are to undertake any considerable scheme in London; I do not know that, compared with other items, it would be a very large one.

673. Then do you think that although they are somewhat out of date, there is very good reason for these model clauses—that they do not put an undue burden on the companies? Suppose, for the sake of argument, that they are out of date, do you think the burden they inflict, even if not strict enough—put it in that way—is undue?—No; I do not think it is an undue burden. Railway companies get great advantages under their Bills, and I do not see why they should not make some return for them.

674. Do you think greater elasticity should be given to the Home Office in regard to the schemes they promote?—I mentioned some points in which I thought greater elasticity might be given in my evidence in chief.

675. You propose to hand us some suggestions as to the wording of a clause?—The Chairman asked me to prepare something

676. Then this is my last question: As regards the statement made (I think you heard it) by Mr. Byrne that statutory companies can only own property by express statutory powers, that is the view I understand of the Home Office, is it not?—I do not think you can say that the Home Office has any "view" upon that point.

677. But they act as though they had, do not they?—No; the Orders were originally drawn, I believe, on that view; but as they have been recently amended, I think that view must be taken as rather abandoned.

678. As abandoned?—Yes; at all events, the later amendments of the model clauses have proceeded on the possibility of the companies taking land without statutory powers.

679. Mr. Byrne said you would kindly state the case of Broad Street to us, which practically led to the appointment of this Committee?—I think I stated all the main facts of that in my evidence in chief. I think, if you refer to Questions 75 to 78, you will find that the main facts of that case, so far as they are known to the Home Office, are put there.

680. Very well. Assuming that to be so, it raises a question as to whether the company could acquire and hold lands without express Parliamentary power?—That is involved in this case—yes.

681. And did not you find that the fact that the company had purchased the property in that way put the Home Office in considerable difficulty in bringing them to book as to their obligation to rehouse?—It put them altogether outside the Standing Orders and the model clauses as now drawn.

682. In other words, if the railway company in this case had not voluntarily agreed to reinstate and to retain the property for workmen's dwellings, other companies could have done likewise; and would not the effect of that have been that practically the Standing Orders would have been a dead letter?—Well, I made suggestions which, if accepted by the Committee, I hoped would prevent that recurring again.

683. In other words, you attach considerable importance to that particular case?—Yes; I consider it a case that very clearly illustrates a weak point in the present model clause.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered that this Committee be adjourned to Wednesday, 28th May, 12 o'clock.

Die Mercurii, 28° *Maii*, 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN.	Mr. BOND.
Earl CARRINGTON.	Mr. JESSE COLLINGS.
Viscount HAMPDEN.	Mr. CREAN.
Lord HATHERTON.	Dr. MACNAMARA.
Lord WENLOCK.	Sir JOHN TUKE.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN IN THE CHAIR.

MR. NOEL T. KERSHAW is called in; and Examined as follows:—

Chairman.

684. YOU are, I think, Assistant Secretary to the Local Government Board?—That is so, my Lord.

685. And the Local Government Board, I believe, inquire into all these Bills by which any interference occurs with dwellings of the working classes?—Yes, where 10 or more are taken outside of the metropolis.

686. Will you tell the Committee then what steps the Board take to see that the companies and local authorities do their duty in the matter of submitting schemes. Before I ask you that, of course when you say the Local Government Board inquire into all Bills you mean Bills whether they are promoted by railway companies or whether they are promoted by private companies?—Yes.

687. Or individuals?—Or local authorities or individuals. Shall I take local authorities first? As regards the local authorities, in the majority of cases they have to come to the Local Government Board for sanction to the loans required to carry out the works involved in the Bill, and therefore the Local Government Board have the opportunity of knowing whether they are in fact proceeding with the acquisition of 10 or more houses. When the application is made for sanction to the loan we say to them: Well, but you are restricted by this clause in your Act so that you cannot take 10 or more houses until a scheme has been approved. We ask them then to submit a scheme—which they do.

688. If they did not want the loan what would happen then in regard to local authorities?—Where the Board's sanction is not necessary, in fact in all cases where local authorities obtain Acts of Parliament, a list is made of them at the end of the Session, in all cases I should say in which there is a working class statement deposited showing that 10 or more houses are proposed to be taken. In all cases where the Bill becomes law those Acts are looked into. At the end of the Session a list is made, and when one of our inspectors goes into the borough, or

Chairman—continued.

town, or village where the improvement is to be carried out, he inquires whether anything has been done; so that we keep our eyes on them in that way. Of course in most of these local Acts there is a limited period for the execution of the works, and for the purchase of the land; and if that period is not extended at the end of the term the Act goes off the list.

689. But supposing that it was a company,—what would you do in that case?—In the case of companies the Act goes on a separate list in the same way; and in the case of companies also we are from time to time intormed by local authorities and private persons that they are taking houses. Of course people do not always know whether they are taking more than they are allowed to take, but they represent the fact that the company are proceeding with their scheme. Then we write to the company and ask them what the facts are and point out that a "scheme" is necessary, if they are taking 10, or more than 10.

690. Are the company not obliged to come to you themselves before they begin to proceed under the Act?—They are; and in the vast majority of cases I certainly think they do. The others are only the exceptional cases showing the precautions that are taken by the Local Government Board in case any company or local authority should fail in doing their duty, and even in these cases it is not always that their failure to come for approval to a scheme is due to culpable negligence on the part of the local authorities or the companies. Sometimes, certainly, they genuinely overlook the Clause. Sometimes they are made by an Act to buy property which contains houses of the working classes but which was not included in their original bill; and they very naturally in those cases overlook the fact that they are purchasing—possibly not demolishing—houses of the working classes to the number of more than 10. A case of that kind which I have in my mind is a Manchester Ship Canal case, where during

Chairman—continued.

during the passage of the bill through Parliament a provision was inserted that the company should take over certain other canal undertakings; with these canal undertakings they had to take over certain cottages, and the fact that they had bought these cottages was overlooked.

691. Now do the local authorities often draw your attention to instances of non-compliance?—As I have said, instances of non-compliance are not frequent, but they have drawn our attention to cases of non-compliance.

692. And is it your experience that the local authorities keep a vigilant watch over the carrying out of these Acts?—It is rather difficult for us to say with regard to that. We have had, I think, two or three cases in which they have drawn our attention to what was supposed to be an infringement of the clause; but as I say I think cases of infringement are really very rare outside London; I have no knowledge as regards London, but outside London, so far as our knowledge goes I should say that cases of infringement are really rare.

693. Of course your experience is entirely limited to the extra-metropolitan area?—Entirely.

694. Now when there is a case in which a company proposes to take 10 houses or more, what steps do the Board take—how do they proceed?—When the company have informed us that they propose to take a certain number of houses, we write a formal letter to them asking for certain particulars. The particulars are, generally, a plan of the locality showing the houses to be acquired (we ask them to colour a plan) plans and elevations of the new houses proposed to be erected in pursuance of the scheme, including a block plan of the site showing details of the drainage, and a statement giving the number of persons in each family residing on the 15th of December prior to the passing of the Act, and at the date of the application, in the houses to be acquired, with the names and postal addresses of such persons and shewing as regards each person then and now residing in the houses, and earning a livelihood by any employment, the nature of the employment and whether the place of employment is within or beyond a mile of the dwelling to be taken. I could put in a form of the formal letter if it would be of any service.

695. Then when the answer to that has been received, what do you do then; do you send an Inspector to verify it, or what?—To verify the statement?

696. Yes?—In all these cases we hold a local Inquiry, and the Inspector goes and inspects all the houses to be taken, and the site for the new houses.

697. Before that statement is received or after?—After the statement is received and after the scheme is submitted.

698. Then can you describe to us the mode of his Inquiry, the time and the manner of holding it?—Yes; there is a restriction as regards the time. The Inquiry is never allowed to be held before six in the afternoon so as to give an opportunity for the working-class people who

Chairman—continued.

are to be displaced to appear and they do appear. At the Inquiry of course the company (if it is a company's case) are usually represented, and, almost invariably, the local authority.

699. What steps do you take to let the people know that an Inquiry is going to take place?—We have a large notice (a large placard) printed, which I can show the Committee a specimen of. [*The document is handed in, vide Appendix.*] That is sent to the local authority with a list of the houses proposed to be taken—the list in fact that we have got from the company (in the case of a company)—and we ask the local authority to leave these notices (to the number of four to each house) at each of the houses proposed to be taken. We also send copies of the notice, of course, to the company and their agent.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

700. May I ask you what you mean by the word "company" that you frequently use? What company?—Shall I say "undertakers," other than local authorities?

Chairman.

701. "Promoters," perhaps you had better call them?—Promoters.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

702. Under some Act of Parliament?—Yes, all under Acts of Parliament.

Chairman.

703. Yes, all under Acts of Parliament. *Call* them "Promoters." That will include railway companies, or electric companies, or anybody?—That will include both. I was rather trying to draw a distinction between local authorities and other undertakers.

704. Quite so?—Then another duty, of course, of the Inspector is to go round, and in order to enable us to say what the scheme should consist of—what accommodation should be provided—he has not only to inspect the houses which are to be taken, but also the vacant suitable accommodation. In most cases the promoters furnish a list of the vacant suitable accommodation, and the Inspector goes round with the representatives of the undertakers, and anybody else who cares to go with him; he looks through this vacant accommodation, and makes a report on that point particularly.

705. In short, he makes an estimate as to what accommodation is required,—whether existing vacant accommodation or accommodation to be provided afterwards,—for the number of persons who are displaced?—Yes.

706. Now in his estimate does he usually, or does he invariably, provide for a total number equal to the number that are displaced?—In his estimate that is so—for the total number who are to be re-housed by the scheme.

707. By the scheme or otherwise?—By the scheme and otherwise, including vacant accommodation.

708. Then

Chairman—continued.

708. Then I gather from your answer that he would make a return to the Local Government Board of the houses in the immediate vicinity which he thought were suitable and which were unoccupied?—Yes.

709. Would he in that Report take into consideration the rents and matters of that sort?—He does, as a matter of fact, in his Report, state what the rents paid for existing houses are in order that we may have some idea whether the new houses to be provided will be for the same class of tenant.

710. And does he represent to you whether the rents of the vacant houses are approximately the same as of those which are to be vacated?—He does.

711. Now, do you find that the persons who are going to be displaced take any interest in these Inquiries?—Yes, as a rule, they do; not in any large numbers, but there is seldom an Inquiry passes without some of them attending.

712. And making representations?—Sometimes making representations; generally they are very silent, but they do sometimes make representations. I remember a case some little time ago where a man said the circumstances in his case were particularly hard; he had a small shop, which was practically kept by his wife, and he would lose his connection. The representative of the railway company who was present said: Well, I think we can find a place suitable for this man, and he showed it to the Inspector on his way, and the thing was practically arranged there and then.

713. Then are these tenants usually under notice at the time that you send round to make your inspection?—That I am afraid I can hardly answer; I suppose they would usually be weekly tenants.

714. Do the local authority come and attend these inspections?—Yes; they attend the Inquiries almost invariably, and they generally go round with the Inspector—either the members or the officers; usually of course the officers would accompany the Inspector on his round of visits.

715. Do they often supply a list of vacant houses or make suggestions as to the manner in which these vacancies should be supplied?—As a rule it is the undertakers who supply the lists of vacant houses, because it is in their interest to do so, to show the nature and amount of the vacant accommodation; but local authorities have from time to time represented either that the scheme is too large or that it is too small.

716. Then after this Inquiry is over, I assume that the Inspector reports to the Local Government Board and makes his recommendations?—Yes.

717. Then you proceed to examine his report I suppose?—Yes. The report first of all goes to the Chief Engineering Inspector, who has of course more experience of these things than most of the junior inspectors, and he, if necessary, confers with the Inspector and makes any suggestions he has to make to him; subsequently the report with the recommendations comes before the Local Government Board.

718. Is that a form of scheme that you have got *there*?—I have a form of scheme. Yes.

Chairman—continued.

719. Perhaps you would describe it shortly to us, and put it in?—First of all there is a formal reference to the section under which the scheme is made; then there is a statement of the number of houses which are proposed to be purchased or acquired, which are subsequently specified in the schedule to the scheme; then there is a provision that the undertakers shall erect on a site specified on a plan annexed to the scheme, certain dwellings; then the accommodation that each dwelling will afford is specified in feet and inches; then there is a limit which is required by the clause of the period within which from the date of its approval the scheme must be completed; and there is a provision that "the said dwellings" shall "comply with the requirements of all public and local acts and of any bye-laws and regulations duly made by the local authority and in force in the" district.

(*The Document is handed in vide Appendix.*)

720. Now with regard to the accommodation provided, of course that varies a good deal?—Yes, it varies very much. The class of house most frequently erected is five and six-roomed cottages, but we have had lots of four-roomed cottages—one-room tenements—two, three, and four-room tenements—flats—and in one case a municipal lodging-house.

721. Of course it would depend very much upon whether these houses are in the country or in the suburbs of towns or in the towns themselves?—Quite so.

722. Now with regard to the rents; do you take any interest in the rents of the new houses?—We do not attempt to fix the rents. We did at one time in some cases—for a short time—attempt to fix the rents, but we recognised that we had really no power to enforce those rents when once we had fixed them; and we thought it was on the whole perhaps best to leave the thing to the laws of supply and demand.

723. There is nothing said about it, I think, in the Model Clause, is there?—Nothing.

724. Then in reality the re-housing body has the right of fixing its own rent for these new houses?—Yes, just as any other private owner would have; that is to say they fix the rent which they can get.

725. Quite so; and have you any reason to know whether, as a rule, those rents are equal to or higher than the rents formerly paid?—No, we have not. We have no information on that point except in one single case; there they happened to be a little less; but I think there were exceptional reasons in that case.

726. Do you ever receive any complaints as to the rents of new houses?—None whatever. Our information on the point is not at all complete—because, as we have not taken the point of attempting to fix the rents, it does not directly interest us—but, as a rule, I believe, these houses are mainly not occupied by the persons displaced. The only accurate record I have is of one case where 200 persons were displaced and 39 of them went to the new houses—39 out of 200

Mr. *Bond.*

727. Where was that?—I think I can tell you. Would it do if I add that to the answer of the question?

728. Perfectly

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

728. Perfectly as far as I am concerned?—The case was at Salford, in the case of a scheme carried out by the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.

Viscount *Hampden:*

729. That is not at all an isolated case, is it?—It happens to be one in which the Inspector, when he went down, had this information given to him.

730. It is not an isolated instance, is it?—Not necessarily. I think it is certainly generally the case, but it is the one case in which we have had accurate figures submitted to us.

Lord *Hatherton.*

731. Have you any information as to what became of the remainder; did they overcrowd the district?—We have no information as to that.

Chairman.

732. When these new houses are finished do you inspect them?—Yes.

733. You have told us you require them to satisfy all the local Acts and to satisfy the local authorities, but do you yourselves inspect them?—Yes, we send down an Inspector at the end of the period allowed by the scheme for its completion or as soon as we conveniently can afterwards, we send down an Inspector who inspects and measures the houses.

734. When one of these schemes has to be carried out what security do you take that the scheme is carried out?—We take a bond in favour of the permanent secretary for the time being, in the case of promoters other than local authorities, for an amount representing roughly the value of each house to be erected under the scheme—from £50 to £200 as the case may be.

735. In the case of a local authority you except them; you do not require a bond from them?—No; in the case of local authorities we come so constantly across them that there is no difficulty in seeing that they do carry the scheme out.

736. Now with regard to the question of the new houses being built before the old houses are evacuated what security do you take that that is done—or do you in any case dispense with that requirement?—It is a provision in the Clause that the houses shall be erected before the people are displaced, but there are cases in which the Board have dispensed with this requirement. Those cases are generally cases where the Board are satisfied on the one hand that the acquisition and demolition of the buildings is a matter of urgency from the point of view of the promoters, and where on the other hand they are satisfied that there would be no hardship on the occupiers. As an instance of the two points take the case where, owing to difficulties, the promoters have not been able to exercise their compulsory powers until they have very nearly expired;—that is an instance on the one hand;—the other case is where there is a large amount of vacant suitable accommodation. I have a note here of the Barry case (a very recent case) which is very much in point on that second point—the existence of vacant accommodation. When the Inspector went down there the local authority said: We do not want these houses which the railway company propose to erect; the fact is we have got so many vacant houses in our district that we are approaching this railway company and asking them to run particularly cheap trains in order to induce people to come and fill these houses In that case we had no hesitation in dispensing with the requirement.

Chairman—continued.

737. And that was not merely that you did not require the one set of houses to be finished before the other was vacant, but you dispensed with the requirement altogether?—No. We think we have no power to do that under the clause as it stands; but all we required was the scheme which the company themselves proposed, namely, two houses. There was a formal compliance with the clause, nothing more.

738. Now, as a rule, do you find that these schemes are faithfully adhered to?—Very faithfully. Of course, we have had one or two cases where, perhaps, the drains have not been perfectly satisfactory. We have asked the promoters to put them right and they have done so. Sometimes the measurements have been rather larger, sometimes a few inches smaller than they ought to have been, but really nothing of consequence.

739. You have not often found the promoters endeavour to evade the scheme altogether and to do nothing?—No my Lord. You mean when the scheme has been approved?

740. Yes?—No. We have found sometimes that they have not succeeded in carrying out the scheme within the time limited, that they have not finished it—completed it—when the Inspector has gone down; but in those cases, on the other hand, they have not acquired or demolished the other houses, so that there was no default, except that they had failed to comply with the precise provision of the scheme, which was that the houses should be fit for occupation within the period of (say) twelve months from the date of approval of the scheme.

741. Then with regard to railway companies, has it been your experience that they have faithfully tried to carry out their obligations under the Acts?—I think, as a rule, certainly.

742. Can you give us any exceptions?—Yes.

743. I mean when you say "as a rule"; of course, I do not ask you to give every single exception?—As a very general rule, then, I should say, my Lord, if I may put it in that way, with very few exceptions.

744. Can you give us any that have occurred during the last two years?—I think there has been one case in the last two years.

745. Can you name it?—If the Committee think it desirable, I can do so.

746. Yes, I think you had better name it?—It was the Midland Railway Company. I think I am giving the name rightly; if not, I will correct it.

747. Do that, please, give it correctly?—Exactly, that is why I would rather not have mentioned the name. In that particular case the Company found that their agents were acquiring the houses and that they actually had acquired more than ten but not demolished any;

Chairman—continued.

any; they discovered their mistake, and came to us at once with full information.

748. And told you that they were taking more than ten?—Yes, they told us that they had, under a misapprehension, taken more than ten, and they asked us what they should do, and brought up the scheme forthwith. This was in October 1901, and the scheme was approved in March of this year. That is the only case that I know of even partial failure within the two years.

749. Go back as far as five years; were there any others that you could name by name?—No, I do not think that there are any within five years (*referring to papers*). No, nothing within five years.

750. I think that is far enough back for my purpose. Now in calculating as to the number of persons who are to be rehoused, what are the considerations which chiefly guide the Board?—The main consideration are set out in the Clause itself. Perhaps I might read them: The Board are to have "regard to the number of persons on or after that date residing in such houses, and working within one mile therefrom, and to the amount of vacant suitable accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood of such houses, or to the place of employment of such persons, and to all the circumstances of the case."

751. How do you interpret those last words in a general way—what other circumstances come in?—We have considered that that would cover such circumstances as the character of the employment of the particular individuals; for instance, suppose that they were dock labourers to whom it was absolutely essential that they should be very near to their work, we should not then have any regard to vacant accommodation which was distant more than (say) half a mile at the outside, unless it was actually more convenient for the particular work of the man.

752. Is it your experience that the persons who are dishoused are the same persons who are rehoused?—No.

753. That of course is a matter which your Inspector would be more familiar with than yourself, but are you in a position to give an answer to that question?—I think I can answer it generally—that the persons who are housed are not to any large extent the persons who are displaced. I gave the one instance in which we have actual figures.

754. Have the promoters ever suggested to you that instead of building new houses they should acquire houses already existing?—Yes, that has been suggested; but the Board have always objected to that, as in their view the purpose of the clause was to compel the erection of houses which would not otherwise have been built.

755. To be an addition to the existing supply?—Yes, in substitution for the part of the supply that was being taken.

756. Then your objection would not lie to the fact that the houses proposed to be bought were unoccupied, or anything of that sort; it is on the other ground that you object?—That they were insanitary?

757. Yes?—Oh no!

758. Simply that you think the number of houses ought to be the same as it was before?—Unless there is adequate vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood—taking that Barry case as an instance which I quoted just now. In a case like that, even though there were houses to be demolished, we should not considered that it was necessary to replace the whole of them, or anything like the whole of them.

759. Now in your dealing with the local authorities in these case, do you always inform them of your schemes and of all the proceedings that are taken or are going to be taken in connection with them?—What we do is to give them the notice of the Inquiry, a specimen of which I have shown to the Committee just now, and invite them to attend; and as a rule they do attend; in fact there are very few cases in which the local authority have not been represented; and at the Inquiry of course the Inspector has instructions to hear anything that the local authority may wish to say.

760. It has been suggested to us that the consent of the local authority should be required—what do you say to that?—I scarcely see any advantage in that, my Lord. The local authority have the opportunity of seeing the scheme and telling us everything that they want to tell us, and it would be, I am afraid, rather causing difficulties and delays if you had two authorities whose consent was necessary to the one thing.

761. Now leaving that and coming to the long clause itself, have you any suggestions to make in regard to the wording of the clause?—May I take the Standing Order first, my Lord; will it be equally convenient?

762. Certainly. Let us take the Standing Order—38 is it not?—Yes; Standing Order 38 of the House of Commons. May I read the little bit that concerns this?

763. Yes?—It is only one little point. The promoters have to "deposit in the Private Bill Office and at the office of the Central Authority, on or before the 31st December, a statement of the number, description and situation of all such houses;" that is the working class houses that they propose to take under their Bill. "Description and situation"—that is sometimes understood by promoters to mean bricks with slated roof; and "situation" is given (say) as "the township of Manchester." Well it is very difficult even with the assistance of the deposited plan to trace what those houses are; and what I would venture to suggest there is that the number (if any) or the postal address should be required. I do not think there would be any great difficulty in the Promoters' supplying that; they must have it for the purposes of their Notices.

764. Could you give us your definite proposed amendment of the Standing Orders in words?—I think if the Committee added "and postal address" after "situation" that that would meet the point.

Viscount *Hampden.*

765. What is the object of the postal address?—So that the houses can be identified.

766. They all have the same postal address?—The

Viscount *Hampden*—continued.

—The postal address is "No. 31, High Street," or whatever it may be.

767. They may not have numbers?—The "postal address" I take it would mean the address to which you would address a letter.

768. Then you would have to go and inspect the houses?—Oh certainly; but the difficulty is that supposing (as in one case happened) the houses disappear and we want to find out whether there has been any infraction of the Clause, if you have merely "bricks and slate" as a description of the house and "township of Manchester" as the situation there is considerable difficulty in tracing the house.

Chairman.

769. Then would you suggest any further alteration. "And the number of persons residing therein"—does that sufficiently describe the persons do you think?—It is also a question for the consideration of the Commitee, I think, whether the number of the houses is the best basis to go upon.

Mr. *Crean.*

770. "And the number of persons"—Whether it should not rather be the number of persons instead of "10 or more houses."

771. "The number of persons residing therein"?—Yes; but suppose the local authority promote a Bill by which they take a common lodging-house that counts as one house though there may be 200 people in it: you may displace 200 people where you only take one house.

Chairman.

772. Yes; but the words of the Clause "and the number of persons residing therein" would cover that?—Yes, but it would not bring it within the Clause.

773. It must be 10 houses?—It must be 10 houses.

774. Quite so. Then you would propose, in fact, to alter the whole principle of the law upon which the Clause is based?—It is only a point for the consideration of the committee.

775. That is all; but what is your own opinion?—My own opinion is that in many ways "persons" would be more satisfactory than "houses"; "houses" vary so much in the number of occupants.

776. At what number of persons would you begin?—I am afraid I could hardly express an opinion upon that; but personally I would make another suggestion, which is that whether you are going to take "houses" or whether you are going to take "persons" some distinction should be made between an urban district outside London and a rural district. In a rural district the undertakers might take 9 houses without any scheme at all, and that might mean practically taking the whole of the labouring class accommodation in that "parish; because there you are limited to a parish,"—whereas in an urban district you might take 10 houses and the loss of them would not be felt.

777. Then what would your remedy be?—I think if you adhered to the "houses" as the basis of your calculations then you might reduce in the rural districts the number of houses which would render a scheme necessary.

Chairman—continued.

778. You would reduce in a rural district?—I would reduce in a rural district.

779. But would you propose to retain the same number in the other districts—in the urban district?—I almost think you would have to on account of the smaller urban districts.

780. I thought your idea was that the clause should turn on "persons" rather than on "houses"?—I think it should, but I would retain my proportion; I would still have a smaller proportion requiring a rehousing scheme in a rural district than in an urban district.

781. I see, you would make your Act begin to work at an earlier figure in a rural district?—In a rural district, that is so, my Lord. There is one other suggestion I should like to make if I might, and that is that in the case of Promoters other than local authorities the Working Class Statement and Plan might very well be deposited with the local authority concerned at the some time that they are deposited with the central authority. That would get rid of any doubt as to whether the statement was in fact a genuine statement. The local authority would then have an opportunity before the Bill came before the Examiners under Standing Orders to make a representation if they considered that the statement was not a *bonâ fide* statement.

782. As it is you send them in the proposed scheme so that they have the opportunity now—only it is later?—Yes, and it is only after the Bill has become an Act.

783. After the Bill has actually passed?—Yes. This would be before the reference to Examiners under the Standing Orders. I think it would perhaps tend to get rid of the idea which so far as we are concerned we scarcely think is justified—that these statements are to a certain extent bogus statements.

784. No other question occurs to me—is there anything you wish further to say?—I think not my Lord.

Lord *Wenlock.*

785. You mentioned rural districts where possibly some promoters might come and take the whole of the accommodation inside that rural district. Have you ever known any cases of that kind?—No; we hardly should know of them, because if they only took 9 houses they would not come within the Clause.

786. Have you ever known them take 10 or 11, and so to sweep away the whole of the rural accommodation for the working-class under any Act?—No, I do not think so.

787. Your objection then is theoretical?—My objection is theoretical to a great extent.

788. In point of practice you have not come across any such case?—No, but the hardship might easily exist, without our knowing it, because as I say, the hardship might exist if you took nine houses in many parishes.

789. Just so. Still not even cases of 10 or 11 have come to your knowledge?—No.

790. The others, you think, might have come about even without your knowing it?—In the case of 10 or 11 the scheme would be then required to be made. I have got a list of the schemes which we have approved. Some of them are in small places. The majority of them are in large places.

Mr. *Crean.*

791. Might that list be handed in?—*This* is a list of all the schemes which have been approved Perhaps the Committee would like to have it.

Chairman.

792. Yes.

[*The Document is handed in. vide Appendix.*]

There is one instance where the Birmingham Town Council are taking some houses in some little Welsh villages. Unfortunately, I have not the figures in the villages. One of the villages is called Llansaintffraid Cwmdeuddur. I take it that is not a very large village. Altogether in three villages they took 31 houses.

Lord *Wenlock.*

793. Is that for a water works?—That is for the Birmingham Water Works. There they have provided houses in place of these. Those are the smallest places I can see. The vast majority of *these* are very much larger.

794. I take it that if your suggested alterations were placed in Standing Order 38, you, from your experience, would be satisfied that they would meet all the cases likely to arise outside London?—I think so. I think it really would rather more meet contingencies than anything else. I believe we do meet the vast majority of the cases.

Mr. *Bond.*

795. You have had occasion to study and have studied very successfully the language of these Clauses of the Standing Orders; may I ask you whether you do not consider that the language of them is directed to the hypothesis that the new houses are to be provided for the accommodation of the people who are to be turned out?—Well, there I should venture to differ as regards the Clause; that is to say, the Standing Order says distinctly "or proportion of such persons"—that is to say, of the persons displaced; but the Clause does not—the Clause differs in that.

Viscount *Hampden.*

796. Where are those words?—In Standing Order 183A, my Lord, about four or five lines down in your copy, "Such persons." If we look at the Clause it is different.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

797. What page is it?—Page 72 of the model clauses I have got it on. "They shall have obtained the approval of the Local Government Board to a scheme for providing new dwelling's for such number of persons as were residing in such houses on the 15th day of December last or for such number of persons as the Local Government Board" and so on.

Mr. *Bond.*

798. Yes, but will you go on?—Yes, "shall after the inquiry deem necessary, having regard to the number of persons on or after that date residing in such houses, and working within one mile therefrom" and other things.

799. And "or to the place of employment of such persons"?—Yes.

800. That is to say the people actually residing in the houses?—Yes.

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

801. And the conditions and suitability of the accommodation for those particular people whose convenience was to be consulted in the rehousing scheme, and I rather understood from you—if I did not mistake—that you did go into the question of the occupation of the people who were to be displaced?—Yes, certainly.

802. In considering whether or not the accommodation should be required to be provided near the old houses or at some distance from them?—Yes, certainly.

803. That would seem to imply that you were to expect the people displaced to come into the new houses?—We should be quite content that they should.

804. I am asking whether the language of the one and the practice of the other, the Local Government Board do not imply an expectation that the people displaced should come into the new houses?—I scarcely think it is "an expectation."

805. Have not you said that so far as the Standing Order is concerned, that is so?—So far as the Standing Order is concerned, yes; but what we are governed by is the Clause.

806. I do not want to labour that point; what I want to get at is this—that the people who are turned out do not as a rule get into the new houses?—They do not as a rule go into the new houses.

807. If that be so, would it not, in your opinion, be better that both the Standing Order and the Clause, if necessary, should be remodelled in such a way as to make it quite plain that what is intended is not that the people turned out should be replaced in the new accommodation; but that an equivalent number of houses, or such number of houses as the Authority may consider reasonably equivalent, should be substituted for the houses demolished?—If that is not plain already. I think it is perfectly plain that you cannot insist upon the people who are displaced inhabiting the new houses.

808. No, it is perfectly plain; but a good many delusions seem to prevail upon the subject?—Yes.

809. Then with regard to the question of fixing the rent, you do not follow the practice of the Home Office, you do not attempt to fix the rents of the new houses?—We do not.

810. I was not here during the earlier part of your examination, so that you may have already answered this question: Do you, when you are approving a scheme, lay down any stipulations with regard to the character of the houses in excess of those local obligations which I understood you to say the scheme obliges the promoters to comply with?—We do sometimes, mainly as regards the provision (which the bye-laws do not provide for) of a food store. That is the main thing in which we go beyond the bye-laws.

811. Any extra stipulation of that kind must of course tend to increase the cost of the houses above the normal cost?—If it is not normal provide a fuel store.

812. Anything that means increased cost in providing the new houses mu t make it rather

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

more difficult for the rents to be charged for those houses to be equivalent to the rents charged for the demolished houses?—Any increased expenditure of course certainly must.

813. I am not quite sure whether these clauses are embodied in the housing scheme under the Artisans Dwellings Act?—No, sir, they are not.

814. Therefore to ask you a question about the practice of the Board upon those schemes would be out of order upon this inquiry. I was not quite sure whether the Clauses in the Standing Orders did apply?—They do not apply in this case.

815. They do not apply?—No; but I should be happy to give any information that might be of any use.

816. There is, I think, a suggestion that the consent of the local authority might be required to the schemes?—Yes.

817. Then, as a matter of fact, is not there something in the nature of a double jurisdiction in the case of the schemes under the Artisan's Dwellings Act?—Do you mean the consent of the local authority and the consent of the central authority?

818. Yes;—I mean I am taking a case?—You are taking a case where the local authority decide to arrange with some persons or company for the execution of the scheme which has been approved? Then that would depend upon the terms of the scheme.

819. The terms of the scheme?—The terms of the particular scheme.

820. But as a matter of fact you have had such cases, have you not?—Yes, we have had one such case.

821. Has that created embarrassment or not?—I think it created considerable embarrassment.

Chairman.

822. Could you describe it to us?—This was a case (Mr. Bond will perhaps correct me if my memory is wrong) under Part II. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, where the London County Council made a scheme with regard to a street called Ann Street, in Poplar. When the scheme was approved it provided that the plans of the new houses should be approved by the London County Council and the Local Government Board. The County Council arranged with the East End Dwellings Company (I think it was) to carry out the scheme for them (the erection of these dwellings), and the plans which the East End Dwellings Company originally submitted did not meet with the approval of the Local Government Board, or, I fancy, of the London County Council; I am not quite sure about that; there was some question whether one-roomed tenements should be allowed, and there was also a question of through ventilation, and questions of that kind. The correspondence was going on for a very long time. Ultimately the East End Dwellings Company dropped out and said they would not go on with the undertaking. That is as far as I remember the history of this matter.

Mr. *Bond.*

823. My point which I wish to get out with regard to that is that I think I am right in saying that the company and the London County Council came to terms—that is to say that some plans were sent up by the the London County Council, which they were content to adopt or see adopted?—Yes. I think that was so.

824. And that those plans were then further revised and criticised by the Local Government Board, who made some further demand which the company were not willing to comply with?—I do not remember that. The only other further demand I remember — it is rather ancient history——

Chairman.

825. When was this?—1896—was it not?

Mr. *Bond.*

826. It was about that time?—About that time. I thought the only further demand was as to a restricted occupation of the one-roomed dwellings.

827. There was some further demand. Whether it is material or not, there was a further demand?—Yes; it was not, I think, any question of the plan.

828. I mention it for the purpose of bringing out your view — that if there was a double jurisdiction, and a double consent required, it might lead to considerable delay and possible friction?—Yes.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

829. Was this a case of compulsory rehousing that you have just been rehearsing to us?—Yes, under Part II. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act—compulsory rehousing.

830. In connection with some demolition of houses by a company?—No, demolition by the London County Council, if I remember rightly.

Mr. *Bond.*

831. The demolition was by the London County Council?—I think it was. It was a scheme under Part II. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act.

Earl *Carrington.*

832. Did I understand you to say in your examination-in-chief that cases of infringement of the Standing Orders are very rare outside London?—Yes, that is as far as our knowledge goes.

833. Mr. Steward, of the Home Office, in answer to Question 304, put by our Chairman, explained the Government procedure so as to verify the schedule of houses which would have to be pulled down for railway and other expansion. That is in the second day's examination,—Mr. Byrne and Mr. Steward, Question 304, pages 21 and 22?—Yes.

834. After telling us how he verified the schedule of houses, Mr. Steward went on to say, "Having made that inquiry, I confer with the company (whatever it may happen to be) as to the number of people they displace; very often I make the number more than the companies do. As a rule we agree within a very small number"—this is what I want to ask your opinion

Earl *Carrington*—continued.

opinion about—"because I can unhesitatingly say that I think the returns made by the railway and other companies that have been sent to me are as accurate as they can be." Now I want to ask you one question on that, Do you confirm that opinion, that railway and other companies' returns "are as accurate as they can be"?—On the whole,—Yes.

835. Your own words were, I think, that they faithfully carry out their obligations with very few exceptions. I took down those words. I think they are your exact words?—I will accept those as my words.

836. There is only one more question I want to ask: That is the only instance you can call to mind where these obligations were not faithfully carried out. Was that the Midland Railway Company's case?—That was the only recent instance, I think the Chairman's question was as to instances "within the last two years," first of all, and then "within five years."

837. That is so?—That is the only instance that I can call to mind.

Chairman.

838. That you said was an exceptional one?—Absolutely accidental, they themselves came and explained to us that it had been overlooked by their agents.

Lord *Carrington.*

539. I perfectly understand there was only one single instance, and that was an accidental one?—That is so.

Chairman.

840. Within the last five years?—Yes.

Earl *Carrington.*

841. There is one more question, that is about the case of Ann Street, Poplar, that you gave us an account of. Are you aware, or do you remember, that ultimately the plan was approved of by the London County Council and your Board, but that the Board put conditions upon the approval of the plans as to the occupation of rooms which the London County Council could not accept—I could not remember whether the London County Council objected on that ground or not; I do not remember that; but I can quite imagine that they did object, because they certainly objected later on on the same point.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

842. Who pays the expenses of the Inspector who is sent down?—The promoters; though part of them are first of all paid by the local authority. The local authority send in the account to us, and we recover—under the powers given by the Clause from the undertakers, whoever they may be.

843. To what extent does the Inspector and the Local Government Board take—or adopt—the views of the local authority as to the question under inquiry?—I only remember one case where the views of the local authority were not adopted.

844. They give consideration to them?—Oh certainly, every consideration.

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

845. But only as a matter of consideration; the local authority have no power to enforce their views, have they?—No.

846. None?—Except of course as regards compliance with the bye-laws.

847. You were saying that it would be well if the plans were deposited with the local authority as well as with the Local Government Board?—The plan and the statement—yes—it was rather the statement.

848. And further some one said that the consent also of the local authority should be obtained to the scheme?—My suggestion does not relate to "the scheme."

849. To any scheme of a company?—My suggestion was this; that when the Bill is deposited and when the plan and the statement of working class dwellings proposed to be taken are deposited with the Local Government Board and with Parliament, a copy of the plan and the statement should at the same time be deposited with the local authority; and that we should clearly get to know whether there are any such cases of infraction as have been mentioned that do not at present come to light.

850. What would be the advantages of the Local Government Board, or any central authority, acting in a locality over the result if the same powers were given to the local authorities?—I think in the first place there would be a considerable want of uniformity, different treatment might be meted out to the same promoters in different localities.

851. My point is this: Suppose a company, a gas company or a railway company, interferes with a town or a locality, how can the central authority in London know as well as the local authority on the spot what should be done in the form of rehousing and other matters in connection with the promoters' scheme?—I think under our system, by the Inquiry that is held, we have the advantage of all the information that the local authority can give us. If they thought the scheme was insufficient, or if they thought it was too much, they would say so at the Inquiry; or if they thought the class of accommodation was not the class of accommodation required; they have a full opportunity of doing that.

852. Would it not save a great deal of trouble if all these powers were put into the hands of the local authorities?—I think it would be very undesirable. It might save a great deal of trouble in one way, but I think the promoters of various undertakings would hardly like to place themselves in the hands of a body whose interest it would be, if they looked at it from a pecuniary point of view, to have as many houses erected as they could cause the company to erect, because it would increase their rateable value, and so reduce their rates.

853. You think the local authority would abuse their power?—I do not think so necessarily, but I think the undertakers would certainly think they would be liable to.

854. It is only a fear on your part that they would do what was unnecessary?—I think there would be such a fear on the part of the undertakers.

855. Seeing

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

855. Seeing that you do not interfere with the rents what is the objection to leaving the supply of houses to replace those which have been pulled down to private undertaking?—The objection is, so far as we are concerned, that the Clause requires that the undertakers should provide them.

856. Suppose the Clause was done away with altogether what would be the result. Of course one can understand that in London, where a company is compelled to provide dwellings at less than the economic rent, the Clause has that effect?—Quite so.

857. But in the country, where you say you do not interfere with the rents at all, would it in your opinion not be better to leave the whole question to private enterprise?—The difficulty would be this, would it not, that you would have these houses taken all at one time and the tenants would be put to considerable inconvenience unless the supply of houses was provided before the promoters pulled down the ones they bought? There would be no security that that would be so. Our position with regard to that—if I might add to my answer—is simply this, that we have regarded the clause as intended to secure that the supply of houses of a certain class shall not be inconveniently diminished.

858. You referred to Birmingham. I do not know if you are acquainted with their great improvement scheme of some years ago?—To a certain extent.

859. Perhaps it was before your time?—It was before my time, but I am aware of it.

860. Are you aware that there was an enormous displacement there?—Yes.

861. And are you aware that the whole matter arranged itself?—I am.

862. Satisfactorily, by the law of supply and demand?—Yes.

863. And that there was no hitch?—So I have always understood.

864. And are you aware that, left to private enterprise, houses were provided in localities where a *bonâ fide* demand existed?—I have no doubt that is so; but really my acquaintance with the facts is too superficial to enable me to answer these questions with any advantage, I am afraid.

865. You would not like to have other schemes left to the same plan which has worked so satisfactorily there. I am not speaking of London?—No, I think it is quite possible that we might find that Birmingham in another way was as exceptional as London. I should not like to speak offhand on that point.

866. In what respect exceptional?—I should like, for instance, to look into the state of trade at that time, so that I might know whether, at that particular time, population was rather inclined to leave Birmingham.

867. My question only related to the principle. The principle would not be applied to London which is of such an enormous size, but to cities of about (we will say) 300,000 or 400,000 population; the question is whether or no in your opinion rehousing of any kind—seeing that rents are not touched—might not be left, with a satisfactory result, to the law of supply and demand, and to private enterprise?—There are really two questions there—whether it might not be left to the law of supply and demand first of all:—as to that I think that the point that I mentioned just now holds good, namely, that a large destruction of a certain class of houses is to take place, and the probability is that private enterprise, knowing very little about the fact that the displacement of the tenants is going to take place, will not have provided the accommodation to which these people, if they wish, can go.

868. Are you aware of any case—with the exception perhaps of Glasgow—in which wholesale destruction was adopted in any improvement scheme, or in which gradual pulling down was not adopted?—I think I am aware of a good many cases, meaning by "gradual," anything under 10. Of course it depends upon the number

869. I mean as to time:—are you aware of any case where the local authority, having scheduled, we will say, 20 acres of land ever proceeded, except in the most gradual manner, to pull down?—I am not dealing merely with local authorities. We were dealing with promoters generally, were we not? I think that if you took promoters generally, where the contract prices happened to be low, the contract work would be hurried on.

870. Exactly; but in the case of promoters and companies, as opposed to local authorities, as a rule is it not the case that the displacement is very small—that in the case of a large city the displacement of the people is not more than would be absorbed—for the time at any rate—in the accommodation already existing?—I do not think I could say that.

871. There is only one question more: You referred to the case of the operations of Birmingham in Radnorshire and the displacing or pulling down of 15 houses, what was the object of that; what did you mean to illustrate by that?—In that particular case what I meant to illustrate was that in the country, in the rural areas, the removal of five houses may mean a great deal more than the removal of 10 houses in Birmingham would mean.

872. Were they required in their Act to rehouse?—Yes, I explained that at the time I spoke of Birmingham, I think, that it was one of the schemes that had been approved.

873. You are aware, are you not, that as a matter of fact they have provided accommodation for 50 times as many as they displaced?—I am aware that they are so providing.

874. In fact that they have built a town, you are aware of that?—I have no doubt that is so; but not as regards these particular places; they are still building houses now in these particular places.

Viscount *Hampden.*

875. With regard to the fact that the people turned out, or the majority of them, do not get into the new houses, perhaps the obvious inference is (or more than inference, it may be in your knowledge) that they really do not want to go into them?—I am afraid it is more an inference than anything else. In certain cases we do

Viscount *Hampden*—continued.

do know that the promoters have offered them the first choice.

876. I want to ask you what are the measures which are taken to inform every individual householder that he has the option?—Of going into the houses?

877. Yes?—Nothing further than the notices that are sent round of the Inquiry as far as we are concerned.

878. Generally speaking, would they all have the notice?—They all have notice of the Inquiry held, and at that Inquiry the scheme is explained by the Inspector.

879. There is no notice given to each individual householder that he can have another house or tenement?—Not as far as I am aware. They know the object of the scheme; that is set out in the Notice.

880. I suppose the general effect of the scheme is that although it does not rehouse the people, or the great majority of the people, displaced, yet by maintaining the supply of houses in the district as it was, it enables them, no doubt, to get accommodation, if they so please, somewhere else?—That is our view, and that is the view on which the Local Government Board have always acted. I have here some Minutes—I do not know whether the Committee would like them read—of Sir Hugh Owen and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre on that point. I do not know whether it is thought worth while that I should read them?

Chairman.

881. It is a matter for Lord Hampden?—These Minutes relate to a case where objection was taken (I have mentioned it incidentally once before) by the Corporation to a North Eastern Railway Company's scheme, and Sir Hugh Owen said: "But the objection on which most stress is laid by the Town Council appears to be that the dwellings which the Company propose to provide are of so superior a class to those which have been occupied by the persons who will be displaced that these persons will be unable to avail themselves of them. In fact, it seems to be contended that the new dwellings should be of the same character as those which are to be demolished, and should be such as can be let at like rentals. The Board have not in other cases adopted this view, and the argument against this contention is very fairly stated on behalf of the Company on page 3 of the Report. The Act does not require that the accommodation shall be provided for the persons who are displaced, but for a number of persons proportionate to the number displaced. It frequently happens that the property that is demolished is of such a character that it could not be expected that new dwellings could be provided at a like rental and for persons in the position of those who have been required to leave. The accommodation that is provided has been for the better class of working men, and the accommodation which has been set free by their removal to the new houses becomes available for persons whose means are less." Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, who was President at the time, says, "The case is not free from difficulty. I agree, however, in the main, with Sir H. Owen, that we should approve the scheme

Chairman—continued.

of the railway company." This is an extract from the Report which is referred to, "Mr. Stephenson, who appeared for the company, after having explained the scheme, said he did not in any way contend that the proposed houses would provide accommodation for those persons who would have to vacate the dwellings in Railway Terrace. First because the position of the new houses was not in any way suitable to the dwellers in Railway Terrace, and, secondly, because the rents of the new houses would be higher than those paid for the tenements to be removed. Recently large numbers of working men employed in Newcastle had shown a tendency to take up their residence at the east end of the town near the proposed site. The new houses were to be erected for the purpose of providing accommodation for such persons. Those who could afford to leave the centre of the town and go to the outskirts at the east would necessarily vacate the houses they now occupy. These houses would be taken by poorer persons, and the result would be a 'shifting up' or gradual upward improvement. He therefore considered that those persons living in Railway Terrace would have no difficulty in finding suitable accommodation." Those are the sentences that were referred to in Sir Hugh Owen's and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's Minutes.

Mr. *Crean.*

882. You have suggested an alteration in this Clause as to the number of houses, and you propose to substitute for it the number of people displaced?—Yes.

883. Could you give me an idea of the average number of people dealt with, generally speaking, in the Housing classed under this Act?—In working class houses.

884. Yes.—I am afraid that would be quite impossible.

885. It would depend upon the locality?—In any particular locality you mean.

886. Yes?—We might be able to do that with the assistance of the Medical Officer of Health Reports if the Committee wanted it as regards any particular place; but they would get that more easily from the local authorities, I think who would have the Reports of their Medical Officers of Health, in which no doubt the fact would be stated.

887. You take into consideration not alone the number of houses, but the number of people occupying the houses?—Certainly.

888. You give that?—As regards the houses involved in each particular scheme, that is given in the statement before you.

889. Would not that be a guide, if we were so disposed, to fix the number of people displaced instead of the number of houses demolished—would not that help us?—I scarcely think it would.

890. We should have some basis to go on?—Yes, but it would be a very unsatisfactory basis, I think. Supposing the case of a single row of houses where you have a house at the corner which is a common lodging-house, then some other houses which are occupied by a man and his wife, then another lot consisting of tenement dwellings.

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

dwellings. It would be a rather unsatisfactory basis I think.

891. Would you deem it necessary to differentiate even between houses occupied as common lodging-houses which had to be demolished and tenement houses?—I think certainly. You see, in a tenement house, under the Standing Order each tenement is calculated as a house.

892. As a separate dwelling?—Yes; whereas in the case of a common lodging-house it is only calculated as one house.

893. Then when you fixed the number of persons it would be more in relation to lodging-houses than to houses occupied by separate families?—That is where the difference would mainly come in.

894. Would you make the alternative "houses"?—Houses or persons?

895. Yes.—That would involve considerable difficulty to the undertakers, and I should doubt whether it would be worth while; you see it would involve a duplicate statement to the undertakers.

896. Would not this alteration be an advantage too, to have not alone "the number of persons residing therein," but also the occupation of those persons?—We get that.

897. Do you?—Yes.

898. Your Order does not state it?—No; but you see we have to approve of the scheme and we get what particulars we like. We are not so much concerned with the occupation of the people who occupied these houses in (say) 1896; the occupation we want is the occupation of the present people, and that we can get from the undertakers at the time of submitting the scheme.

899. You say that you never recently have fixed rent for the houses that are newly built?—Yes.

900. Are you aware that the Home Office are in the habit of not alone fixing the rent, but fixing the time for which it is continued, 25 years?—If you will pardon me, that 25 years is fixed by the Act. The scheme requires that the houses shall be used as working class dwellings for 25 years.

901. I will read you the answer of the Home Office witness, which will probably guide you better?—It does last for 25 years of course.

902. The answer I refer to is on page 25 (in the examination-in-chief) question No. 347:—"With regard to the rentals, it has been the practice of the Home Office for a very long time—in fact from the beginning of this question—to assign the rentals to be allowed to be charged for those dwellings. It will be noted that the model clause contains no direct reference to rentals whatever, but the Secretary of State has always claimed the power, and has always exercised it; he has considered that unless the rentals to be charged for the new dwellings were made known to him and fixed for a definite time it could not be said that a scheme for rehousing of the persons displaced had actually been submitted to him"?—Yes.

903. You do not consider it necessary to do such a thing?—No.

904. In fact you have stated that you did not consider that you had the power to do it?—No, I do not think I said that. I did not, I think, say we had not the power.

Chairman.

905. What you told us, if I remember it correctly, was that there was nothing about rent stated in the Act—in the section?—In the Clause, certainly.

Mr. *Crean.*

906. That you did not think you had the power and did not care for it?—No, I do not think that; I do not think I went so far as that.

Chairman.

907. Perhaps it is desirable that you should define exactly how far you think your power does go?—We have not entered into the question. That is a point on which, before we did revert to the system of fixing rents, I think we should go to the Law Officers; but inasmuch as we did originally fix them in certain cases, clearly we considered then that we had the power to do so.

Mr. *Crean.*

908. Arising out of that, you stopped it, feeling you had not the power?—No. It was arising out of the fact that we did not think in the first place that we had any means of enforcing such a requirement, and we objected to putting in a requirement that really we could not undertake to enforce.

909. That you could not undertake to enforce?—That we could not undertake to enforce.

910. Do you think it would be advisable, if any change were necessary, that the change should give the power, without any doubt at all, of fixing the rent?—I do not think it would, because I do not think it is a power that any central authority could undertake outside London. If you are restricted to London it is no doubt practicable, as the Home Office do it, but our limits would be the whole of England and Wales.

911. I am aware of that?—We could not have Inspectors constantly travelling about the country to see that tenants were not being charged more than a certain rent, and the houses not being overcrowded. That involves looking after also the question of subletting.

912. Would not the fact of such a law existing be a restriction on the authority who constructed those houses?—Certainly, on the authorities who constructed the houses, which would be a provision, no doubt, in the Clause. What I take it you suggest is that a provision of this kind should be added to the Clause, that the undertakers—the promoters—shall not charge for any houses provided under the scheme—under this Clause—a greater rent at any time than that which is authorised by this scheme.

913. Limited to 25 years—as limited by the Home Office?—The whole thing is limited to 25 years. That would be your provision?

914. Yes. That would not be objectionable?—It would be open to this objection, I think, in the first place. Who is to enforce that?

915. You would get the same power that the Home Office get?—Yes, but the Home Office have

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

have it in London only—how they do it we are not told; there is no evidence of enforcement *here.*

916. They find that there is never a breach of it according to the evidence given to us?—I have not seen that.

917. And in further statement Mr. Byrne informed us that if a change in the rents is necessary they must apply to the Home Office for power to change the rents?—Yes, certainly—to change the rents approved under the scheme.

918. Yes?—But there was no evidence given, so far as I see, showing that those rents were in any way enforced by the Home Office. They take it that these people—the undertakers—are perfectly honest in the matter, and that they do comply with the provisions of the scheme; but suppose they do not?

219. You would have the power of compulsion?—Suppose this power to be granted to the Local Government Board, how is the Local Government Board to go round, or to send round Inspectors,—to Falmouth, to Manchester, to Birmingham, and every other place named on *that* list, and the list grows every year—how are they to do that and see that every tenant is being charged the rent which is authorised by the scheme? It would be perfectly impossible.

920. I do not suppose it would be possible for you to do it, except you got information from the parties charged?—You mean in representations made to the department.

921. Yes?—Now may I carry that a little further? The object of fixing the rents is presumably to fix them below the commercial value.

922. I would not say that. The object is to secure that the class of tenants disturbed should have proper accommodation provided for them?—Quite so. If the rent to be charged would be the ordinary commercial rent, there would be no necessity to fix it, you see; therefore you fix something under the commercial rent. Very well. For those houses you would have any number of applicants, and anything above what is fixed as (what we might call) a judicial rent, but still below the commercial rent, will still attract a large number of people, who will keep quiet the fact that more than the proper rent is being charged, because they are still getting the house under the market value. I do not think you would get many complaints in those circumstances. The only time you would get a complaint would be when the promoters were actually charging more than the rents charged in the neighbourhood for the same class of accommodation.

923. They could not do that?—They could not do that; quite so; therefore the case would never arise and complaint would never arise.

924. In face of that the scheme as at present carried out does not at all meet the objects for which it was originally intended, that is, to accommodate the class of people who are disturbed?—I should not be prepared to admit that.

925. And how are they accommodated at all if not by the scheme provided?—The point is that the Clause does not say that you shall rehouse the actual people who are disturbed; the Standing Order does but the Clause does not,

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

and if that is the intention that Clause should be altered. The Clause should then say as the Standing Order does: that you shall provide for such people, that is to say for the people who are displaced, the actual people.

925*. You do not assume the actual people, because by your answer you stated that a superior class of people come into these houses?—Sometimes.

926. That is not providing for "the same class"?—If you restrict your rent you still do not provide for the same class of people coming in; all that you do, unless you say that it shall be the actual people who are displaced who are to inhabit these houses, is to leave it to the company to take the best tenants, to let to the best tenants who are not the people who, as a rule, are being displaced.

927. I suppose there would be no extra inducement to the promoters to go in for a better class tenant, who may be able only to pay the same amount of money, if you restrict the rents?—These would be new houses and the company would have their choice of tenants, unless you restrict them to the actual tenants who are occupying the houses which are to be pulled down; the promoters whoever they are have absolutely their choice of tenants, and they will pick out, not the people who have inhabited the houses which are pulled down, but the best tenants.

928. But if we continue to leave them the same power as they have at present to select their own tenants, but restricted the rent, would you consider that any hardship upon them?—I think it is a hardship upon other owners of similar property; you are artificially reducing the rents of the neighbourhood.

929. No?—Surely! If you say that a house, the market rent of which would be 5*s.* a week shall be let for 4*s.*, everybody who is inhabiting the houses valued at 5*s.* will want to go into that house valued at 4*s.* You do not in any way provide by this means for the persons displaced.

930. In practice are you not already doing that; you have told us that you would put on the commercial value?—We do not put any value; we leave it entirely to the law of supply and demand. All we say is this:—In place of these houses which you are destroying you shall provide other houses of a somewhat similar character.

931. Can they be considered of a similar character if you probably double the rent?—I think they can. We do not say that they shall be insanitary houses for instance, as very often the houses to be demolished are. Where a local authority or a company are going to purchase houses for an improvement they naturally do not purchase the best houses; they naturally go where the property is cheapest if they possibly can; therefore in the majority of cases these houses are not the best houses—houses not to in the best condition.

932. Is it your opnion that the same rule as that applying to the City of London should apply to the rural districts or urban districts?—As regards the rents?

933. As regards the rents?—No.

934. From the list you have handed in here

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

we cannot form any idea of proportion between the people disturbed and the proportion of working men in the district altogether. I may say, the question I am asking you now is in reference to your statement that in small places 9 or 10 houses might be the whole of the accommodation for the whole of the working population of the district. In this list here I do not see any particulars as to the working population. Would it be possible for you to give that information?—I am afraid not; I am afraid you will have to get that from the local authorities. You see we have no means of distinguishing except by these lists; and they will not tell the working population of the whole parish.

935. You have "the scheme." Newcastle-on-Tyne of course is a very large place; a certain number of houses were demolished there, a certain number of people displaced—did you recommend any scheme there?—Yes.

936. Do not you take into consideration the proportion between the number of people displaced and the number of working people in the district altogether?—In the neighbourhood—yes.

937. Would it be necessary to give some idea in the schedule which is a guide for you of the number of people; you have not it here. There is no guide to us—looking at it here—175 displaced—185 rehoused; on the face of it it gives us no particulars really as to whether the number you are providing for is the same as the number displaced?—In the case you have mentioned the company actually provided for more than they were displacing.

938. Yes that is so—175 displaced, 185 they built for; but there are other cases—for instance, West Ham Town Council displaced 163, they provided nil.?—Is not there a note at the side.

939. There is I see a note at the side?—It is impossible to give these *in extenso.*

940. "Scheme dispensed with by Board under provisions of Local Act. About 130 houses within half-mile radius?—Yes.

941. Did you take into consideration the local situation of the houses that were so vacant?—Certainly.

942. And the nature of the occupation of those who were displaced?—Yes. We always get a statement in each of these cases (as I mentioned I think earlier) of the nature of the employment of each individual—not merely of the head of the family, but of each individual of the family.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

943. May I pursue the matter of fixing rents for a moment. Has the Local Government Board received any complaints from local authorities as to the nature of the rent fixed in cases of rehousing under schemes?—The Newcastle case is the only one that I am aware of—the one I mentioned just now—which was I see in 1894—that is the only case I am aware of.

944. Have you had any complaints from individuals stating that they are not taking the new houses because of the rent?—No. We have had representations at inquiries that they would not be able to take them by persons who were going to be displaced.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

945. Does that mean a general representation to you at the inquiries?—A general representation at particular inquiries, yes. It is not very often. It is not very frequent.

946. That is what I want to come to. It is not very frequent?—No, not very frequent.

947. It would be possible for a railway company, I suppose, to demolish, to rehouse, and fix such a rental as would enable it to meet its rehousing obligation, and make a very handsome profit to itself?—I could not say with regard to that, I am afraid. I am not a sufficient authority on the cost of building.

948. But, having regard to the demand for houses, might it not be so?—In certain cases, you mean?

949. Yes?—Oh, I think it quite possible, in certain cases, and I should gather that it is so from the fact that in certain cases the companies have proposed themselves to provide for more persons than were actually displaced.

950. Doing that upon purely business lines, obviously?—I should assume so; but I do not think that that would hold good generally. We do come across such cases, but in the majority of cases the companies do not propose to rehouse more than they displace.

951. No, but they may of course fix a rental, there being no veto over them, which would enable them, as I say, to meet their rehousing obligations and still make a profit?—If there is sufficient demand for the houses.

952. As there probably is?—I should not like to say that; in many cases.

953 Have the Local Government Board received no representation as to the great lack of housing accommodation in great urban centres?—Yes, a great many of them.

954. In those cases it would be possible for a railway company, as the demand for houses is so great, to do what I suggest to you?—It would rather depend I think upon whether they could build for the class of people for whom the accommodation is required. It is usually one class of people that there is lack of accommodation for, and usually that is the class that a local builder does not care to build for.

955. I take it that in your view and the view of the Local Government Board it is not desirable that you should have power over the rents fixed?—That is so.

956. Now will you turn to the evidence of the 14th May, page 25, an answer I think given by Mr. Byrne to Question 347; let me read the middle portion: "He" (that is the Secretary of State for the Home Department) "has considered that unless the rentals to be charged for the new dwellings were made known to him and fixed for a definite time it could not be said that a scheme for rehousing of the persons displaced had actually been submitted to him"?—Yes.

957. You indicated as your difficulty that there would be no means of enforcing your veto. Cannot you take the view that the scheme has not been submitted to you unless the rentals have been fixed? You see what Mr. Byrne says there; it all hangs upon that?—It could not be said that a scheme for rehousing——

598. "Had

Dr. *Macnamara.*—continued.

958. "Had actually been submitted to him?" —Rehousing?

959. Yes?—But the Act does not require a scheme for rehousing. That has been my point.

960. You mean the Model Clause?—The Model Clause. The Model Clause is followed in nearly every Act now.

961. Do you take the view that the Model Clause is not intended to provide for rehousing in the case of demolition?—It does not restrict rehousing; it does not restrict the Birmingham Authority to rehousing.

962. Do you take the view that that is the spirit, at any rate, of the phraseology of the Standing Order?—The Standing Order, certainly, but there apparently Parliament in its Model Clause has gone away from its Standing Order entirely.

963. Do you suggest to me that having regard to the phraseology of the Standing Order, Parliament, in drawing up those Model Clauses, did not intend that they should be for cases of rehousing in case of demolition?—I think the difference between the Standing Order and the Model Clause is intentional.

964. Intentional on the part of Parliament?—Yes.

965. That the Model Clauses are not intended to provide for rehousing?—No, I think they are not intended to restrict the scheme of rehousing.

966. That is obviously not the view taken by the Home Office?—Well, I am not sure.

967. I gather from Mr. Byrne that it is not?—In places I rather gathered that it was. *This* is the only part as far as I can see in which Mr. Byrne talked of rehousing, and then in reply to the Chairman he distinctly took the other view. I do not know whether I can find his exact words.

Chairman.

968. There was a suggestion either by Mr. Troup or Mr. Byrne, I forget which, that it might be desirable to insert in the Bill the area of the rehousing as well as the number of houses (and so on) which were demolished?—I think, my Lord, in reply to you Mr. Byrne said that it was not *rehousing*, but *housing*. That is my recollection.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

969. The Home Secretary takes the view that unless the rental is fixed he has not had a scheme presented to him?—We do not take that view.

970. No, I am coming to that. You do not take that view?—No.

971. You observe that the Secretary of State considers it essential that he should have a veto over the rent?—Yes, in London.

972. Quite so; and that if it should ever be held that the provisions of the Model Clause do not enable him to exercise that power, he would strongly recommend to Parliament that the Act should be strengthened so as to provide for it?—Yes.

973. That is not the view of the Local Government Board?—No, because we are not dealing with London. The Secretary of State is dealing with London, and Mr. Byrne restricted his answer to London.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

974. Do you put that to me as a reason for differentiation in polity?—I do not know anything of London; I can hardly say that Mr. Byrne says it is necessary in London; I say the Local Government Board do not consider it necessary, or rather, desirable, outside London.

975. I rather gathered that you thought it impracticable outside?—Quite impracticable outside.

776. Could not you utilise the services of the local authorities?—The Model Clause would not provide for that; if you want to do that the Model Clause must be altered; you must put the duty on the local authority to enforce the rent fixed by the Local Government Board.

977. What is your view about it?—That it should not be done

978. You disagree with it?—Yes.

979. Now for a moment to go to the Model Clauses. Have you any knowledge in a general way of cases where less than 10 houses have been demolished,—has it ever come to you at all?—Less than 10?

980. Yes. Of course statutorily you have no knowledge, I know.—No. Yes, we have had some cases where we thought it necessary to look into the cases to see whether certain undertakers had taken more than 10 houses.

981. Do you know whether 9 is a general number at all in these schemes that do not come before you?—No, I could not say as to that.

982. Do you know whether schemes are taken in part at all in the provinces so as to avoid touching the obligation?—No, I do not know of any instances of that.

983. That does not come under your notice —No.

984. Do you take the view with regard to "persons" instead of "houses," that the definition of a "house" is faulty? I rather gathered as regards "house" that you think it does not quite include everything?—That it does not meet the case of either a Rowton House or a common lodging house.

985. Suppose we are going to take "Rowton" houses could you suggest to us a definition which would be more elaborate than the one we have already?—I am afraid not without bringing in "persons." You see in the case of a common lodging house you would have to bring in the number of persons for which it was certified, or something of that sort, and say that so many persons should count as a house—or something of that kind.

896. Will you make a suggestion to us for improving the phraseology of the Clause along the lines of your evidence?—Taking it as "persons."

987. In any way you think best?—Assuming you adhere to "houses," or both?

988. I do not care; I want to hear your proposal?—My proposal is that you should revert to "persons," rather than "houses"—that is to say, take "persons" rather than "houses" as the basis.

989. Leave houses out entirely?—Yes.

990. Then what would be the specific form of your proposal dealing with persons only?—As to numbers and so on?

991. Yes?—That would require consideration.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

992. You might at a later stage make a suggestion to us, or forward it to us?—If the Committee think that desirable.

Chairman.

993. Yes, I think it would be, as you are proposing a new principle, and, of course, it will really depend upon the actual numbers which you propose. I think it would be very desirable that you should give us it in definite form.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

994. Now, with regard to the area of provincial districts, have you any comment to make upon the present definition of "area?"—I am afraid it is very difficult to get anything better. Of course, "parish" is unsatisfactory, because a "parish" may be enormous or it may be very small, as, for instance—as I think you know—the old parish of Saddleworth in Yorkshire. It is very difficult to get anything better.

995. Have you arrived at any practical suggestion in your own mind about the matter?—No, I do not think anything really is practicable as to that.

996. Now, with regard to the definition of "labouring class," is that satisfactory as it stands?—I think so.

997. You would not wish to modify that?—I would not wish to modify that.

998. In London the definition provides that it must be persons "whose income does not exceed an average of 30s. a week?—There, I think, Mr. Byrne explained that the Secretary of State did not take quite that view as to the 30s. Our view is that that limit of 30s. only refers to the nondescript persons at the end of the Clause, and that artisans would not necessarily be outside the Clause because their income was over 30s. a week.

999. What do you mean by "nondescript persons"—do you mean the words from "persons not working for wages"—those are nondescript are they?—Yes "persons other than domestic servants."

1000. Then have the Local Government Board any discretion with regard to wages in dealing with the labouring class to be rehoused?—No.

1001. You do not go into that at all?—No, so long as they are artisans they are under the Clause.

1002. Under the definition?—Under the definition.

1003. And that definition satisfies you. Does the limitation of "working within one mile therefrom" appear to be satisfactory in your experience. I think you know what I am referring to?—I know exactly. We have not had any difficulty in consequence of, or in connection with that.

1004. You do not want that modified?—We have in addition to that "all the other circumstances." That is only an indication really.

1005. In your opinion does any difficulty arise from the treatment of this question by two State Departments, the Home Office for London and the Local Government Board for the rest of the country?—I do not think we have had any serious difficulties. Of course there is this discrepancy in practice as regards the rent, but that may be accounted for by the fact that one is London, and the other is outside, and that a "fair rent court" may be necessary on this point in London, but may not be necessary outside.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

1006. What do you mean by a "fair rent Court"?—That was a question I think to Mr. Byrne as to whether the Home Office act to that extent as a fair rent Court in London; and he said, "Yes, to that extent."

1007. Would it be your view that the State machinery which exists in one or other of the Departments of the State is quite sufficient to do the whole of this business for London and the provinces?—I do not think it would be convenient for the provinces to have the Secretary of State as the Central authority. We have already a staff of inspectors who are constantly travelling about the country, up and down, and they can hold these inquiries in connection with other inquiries that they have to hold. You see this inquiry is held after 6 o'clock in the evening. The inspector can very well hold an inquiry in the morning and then an inquiry in the evening.

1008. I understand that you see no difficulty from the dual control in this question of rehousing obligation?—I do not think there are any real difficulties. It is always desirable as far as possible of course to have uniformity, and no doubt it is desirable to have all one class of work in one hand; but I do not quite see how that is to be arranged here.

1009. Has the Local Government Board any means of penalising a railway or other company which is not carrying out its rehousing obligation?—The company who have provided a scheme, or the company who have not yet done so do you mean.

1010. Take the two separately?—Take it that they have not submitted a scheme,—then the Local Government Board are empowered by the Clause to proceed against them for penalties; take it that they have got a scheme approved and have not carried it out, then the Local Government Board can enforce the bond which is given in the case of each scheme of so much per house—£50 up to £200 per house.

1011. In regard to both those cases, what has been the experience of the Local Government Board, say, within the past year or two? Have you had in the first place to take action?—I answered that question in reply to the Chairman.

1012. I did not happen to be here. The facts are put in are they?—The facts are put in as far back as five years.

1013. Is it general in the provinces for a railway company, or other company, which is seeking to demolish, and therefore have put upon it rehousing obligations to cause its obligation to be carried out by a municipal authority?—No, it is not general.

1014. Have cases arisen?—No, I do not think we have had a single case.

1015. Have you any view upon that method of meeting rehousing obligations?—No, it has not come before me.

1016. Or by a private building company, an artisan's dwellings company?—There would be no objection to that so far as we are concerned, provided

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

provided the building company acted merely as contractors.

1017. That brings me to the question of private enterprise which was put to you by Mr. Collings. If a railway company is under an obligation to rehouse, and can come to the Local Government Board and say: This obligation will be met—or, we propose this as our scheme, that it shall be met by the houses provided by this private company—would the Local Government Board take objection to that because the rehousing was substantially being done by private enterprise?—They would, unless they were perfectly satisfied that the houses were not going to be built in the ordinary course.

1018. Would not the same objection hold good against any scheme of rehousing submitted?—I answered a question by the Chairman on that point.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

1019. Might I be allowed to correct what Dr Macnamara stated?—I think you understood what my suggestion was. My question referred to leaving the local authority out of the question altogether?—Quite.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1020. Then that reminds me of a question which I forgot to put; you take the view very strongly that it is essential to have a central controlling authority for these matters?—We do.

1021. You strongly desire to represent to us the undesirableness of leaving the local authorities with absolutely a free hand of veto in this matter of rehousing obligation?—In fact, making them the central authority in each case.

1022. Yes. You represent to us the undesirability of that?—Yes.

Chairman.

1023. One question with regard to the area of rehousing. You said that the "parish" is not satisfactory area, but that you do not know of any better?—Yes.

1024. Suppose such words as these were inserted, "Within a reasonable distance" or some words of that sort, should you think that an improvement?—I am afraid that would be very contentious.

Chairman—continued.

1025. The word "reasonable" of course would be interpreted I presume by the Local Government Board?—Yes; but I am afraid there would be difficulties in interpretation. We should, I am afraid, come into considerable conflict with undertakers over the meaning of the word "reasonable" in particular cases.

1026. But you would have the settlement of it?—We should have the settlement of it, certainly.

1027. Then when you were masters would the struggle go on long?—I am afraid it would.

Mr. *Bond.*

1028. I understood you to take the view that if the Local Government Board attempted to fix rents it would be extremely difficult to secure that those rents were adhered to, they having no machinery for the purpose?—Yes.

1029. And also that it would be undesirable from an economic point of view?—Yes.

1030. The case of London was treated as exceptional, and was treated as exceptional I think because it was your conjecture at all events, that the Home Secretary had greater facilities at his disposal for enforcing the rents after they had been fixed?—Yes. If I may put it rather the other way I would say, because it was less difficult to enforce those rents in a small area like London rather than having to travel all over the country to enforce them here, there, and everywhere.

1031. That is the distinction mentioned, that it is more practicable to enforce them in the case of London?—Yes, that it is more practicable.

1032. Not that it is less economically unsound?—No.

1033. Then on another point which arises I think out of Lord Hampden's question with regard to the view which the Local Government Boards takes as to the effect of the system they pursue—that is the system of not attempting to provide for rehousing the people who are turned out, you read the minute of Sir Hugh Owen on that subject—may I ask you whether the reasoning of that minute is convincing to your own mind?—Well I hardly think that is a question I should answer; it is a minute of the Secretary and President of the Local Government Board.

[The Witness is directed to withdraw.]

MR. W. P. BYRNE is again called in; and further Examined.

Chairman.

1034. One of the Committee wishes to ask a question of you with reference to one of your answers which he thought not quite complete; but just before he does so I will put one question to you with regard to a matter which has been raised in the course of the evidence of the last witness. He said that no evidence had been given showing how the Home Office secures the observance of the conditions which it makes with regard to rent in the case of the new houses. Will you tell me: How do they secure that?—In

Chairman—continued.

fact, my Lord, no systematic effort is made by the Home Office to follow up in every case, by inquiry, their directions as to rent, to see that they are carried out. The Home Office is dealing with large and important bodies—bodies used to administrative work; and when rents are formerly assigned by a scheme approved by the Secretary of State, which scheme can be enforced by penalty or mandamus, the Secretary of State as a rule feels that he is justified in believing that the terms of that scheme will be carried out; he

Chairman—continued.

he is not dealing with people who are anxious to evade their legal obligation.

1035. He does not send inspectors to see that the obligation is performed?—Not in any systematic way. It naturally turns up in the course of the surveyor's duties. Mr. Steward ascertains occasionally that the rents are being still kept at the proper figure. He visits the building again perhaps in order to compare it with new buildings that are proposed to be put up and so forth; so that incidentally occasionally he hears whether the rents are actually kept at their proper figure. We have never heard of a case except one, which I will mention presently, in which the rents fixed by the Secretary of State have been alleged to have been departed from, and from the fact that sometimes companies come to the Secretary of State years afterwards and beg him to alter the rents it seems highly probable that the limits as to the rents are kept up. Of course the Home Office would be willing to apply any degree of inquisition that Parliament or this Committee thought necessary in the matter; but we have no reason to think that the rents fixed are departed from. In February, 1899, the London County Council—who, as I have mentioned before, often give the Secretary of State valuable information as to what is going on in various parts—reported that in the case of certain dwellings which were being used for temporary accommodation by the South Eastern Railway Company, the rents had been fixed so high as they had been with the object of keeping the dwellings empty in order that they might be used to meet further liabilities of the Company.

1036. Had been fixed by whom?—It was said that they had been fixed by the Secretary of State at the request of the Company at an unnecessarily high figure. This representation of the County Council was taken into careful consideration. A representative of the Company, Mr. Steward the Surveyor, and Mr. Cunnynghame, one of the Under Secretaries of State, had a conference upon the matter, and the Company satisfied the Secretary of State that they were not keeping the buildings empty with any such object as that which was alleged, but they agreed that in consideration of all the circumstances the rentals might fairly be reduced to a figure below that originally fixed by the Secretary of State; and they were so reduced.

Lord *Wenlock.*

1037. You said in your answer to Question 644: Speaking generally, with one or two exceptions, railway companies have fulfilled their obligations very fairly. Would those remarks as regards railway companies apply to the case of other bodies? Do you find that on the whole they try to evade, or do they come fairly up to, what may be expected of them in this matter of rehousing?—The answer is that, with one or two exceptions, they fairly meet their liabilities.

1038. Then there is no great attempt on the part of different bodies generally to evade their obligations in London?—No, certainly not. There is considerable delay both in the case of local authorities and in the case of railway companies; but when one goes in detail through the correspondence relating to a scheme, and considers the important practical difficulties that have arisen in the way of carrying out the scheme for rehousing, I think a fair minded person would say that on the whole the companies had met the obligations fairly; but there are doubtless cases of delay both of companies and local authorities which are to be regretted.

Lord *Wenlock*—continued.

1039. And in the case of other companies, such as electric, what do you say?—We have had such a very few others; we have only, as a matter of fact, had one other, except a railway company, in England which has had substantial rehousing to be done; that was the Surrey Commercial Dock Company, which had to furnish a rather large scheme. It was the first time they had ever come under this liability, and when negotiations first commenced as to the mode in which they were to carry it out, some delay did take place; that is to say, some delay in bringing home to the Company the precise extent and nature of their obligations, but in a short time the Company put their case in the hands of an experienced surveyor and agent, who had acted for one of the railway companies in a similar matter in connection with the Home Office, and, after that, matters proceeded rapidly and smoothly.

Mr. *Bond.*

1040. I have been a little puzzled by what was brought out in the evidence the other day—that you did not attempt to impose this obligation as regards the fixing of rents upon local authorities, that is to say, upon the London County Council or the Borough Councils; you do not do that?—No.

1041. I do not quite understand what the reason for that difference is?—Well, I should think, roughly speaking, the reason was that the local authorities were presumed to be able to fix the rents for such buildings as they provide, at a figure which will meet the convenience of the class of persons for whom they are providing them; they have not conflicting interests.

1042. As a matter of fact, do you think that has been done?—To answer that fully would mean a survey of all the buildings that have been erected by the London County Council. Speaking generally, I can only say that a large number of the dwellings are provided at very fairly cheap rents.

1043. But not so cheap as those you compel the railway companies to charge?—Some of them are provided at rents lower than some rentals which we have allowed to the railway companies.

1044. Having regard to the difference in the accommodation provided?—Yes, or the locality; it frequently happens.

1045. Do you think there is no danger at all of the London Local Authorities endeavouring to recoup themselves to some extent by charging something like the economic rent?—Yes, the Secretary of State does think there is a danger. We have informally bargained and negotiated with the London County Council in the matter of rent, although the Secretary of State has never said he would *fix* a rent which must be their

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

their maximum. He has decided on the class of buildings which he would allow to be erected, bargaining, before, with the County Council what their rental shall be.—If in a particular case the County Council want (as they occasionally properly do want) to erect a class of buildings in a humble street for poor people, the Secretary of State says: Although they do not reach the standard which I should like to see adopted, I will allow them in this case, but I shall expect you to charge a correspondingly low rent.

1046. Naturally, if the accommodation offered was of a humbler kind, they would charge a lower rent for it?—I think high rents are obtainable even for poor accommodation if the district is very central or otherwise convenient.

1047. At all events you do not place the same obligation upon the London County Council as on a railway company?—No.

1048. That is because you trust the London County Council, subject to what you have said?—Yes.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

1049. That is rather an important question. Is it on account of trusting the London County Council, or does not it arise from this fact—that if you place rents that are under competitive rents on a railway company it is the shareholders who pay the difference?—Yes.

1050. But if you impose upon local authorities the obligation of letting house under economic rents, then it is the ratepayers who make up the difference?—That is true; I have no doubt that consideration is present too.

1051. Therefore is not the reason this—that it would be a "large order" to say to the ratepayers, who were as poor as, or even poorer than, the people who were to be rehoused: You must pay extra rates in order that a few persons might have lower rents: Is not that the reason?—That is certainly an important consideration.

1052. Not a question of "trust" of the town council?—Oh, no!

1053. Holding to the great principle of not making good a few people's deficiencies, which deficiencies would be paid by people as poor as themselves?—That is so. When I used the word "trust," or rather adoped the word "trust," I meant the Secretary of State had reason for trusting to the County Council to charge as low rents as were consistent with their carrying out of the work according to his requirements, and without placing a burden on the rates on account of their building operations.

Mr. *Bond.*

1054. As a matter of fact they are under that restriction, are they not, not to place a burden upon the rates?—Yes.

1055. If they charge a rent which is so high as not to place a burden on the rates, are not they as a matter of fact obliged to charge a rent considerably in excess of that which would be imposed upon the railway companies by the Secretary of State in a similar case?—I do not think I can admit that in general terms; everything depends so much upon the situation and the class of buildings.

1056. I think you will find that is so if you inquire?—Undoubtedly, there are cases of that sort.

Mr. *Crean.*

1057. But I assume that the reason why you do not impose rent conditions on a local authority and do impose them on a railway company is that one is working for profit and the other is not?—That is so. The one is working in the public interest, the other for private profit.

1058. And the one has more direct interest in raising the rent than in simply building to improve the condition of the working classes?—That is so.

1059. The other is building to improve the condition of the working classes?—Yes, and to meet a Parliamentary liability. There is one other point I should like to mention. The sole object of the Home Office in fixing the rent is not to place burdens upon the company, nor to procure good dwellings at a rate below the economic rent. It is one of the chief means of securing that that the buildings erected by the company under these Model Clauses are of the class wanted; for instance, it might often happen that a railway company might with profit to itself erect large blocks of really high-class dwellings to meet the liability imposed by the statute, and let these dwellings at a high rent. For instance, in Lambeth, opposite your Lordships' House, there are dwellings erected by the railway company as to which the Secretary of State has fixed the rent. If the company had not known that the rents would be fixed at a certain low figure it would have paid them really very much better to have built high-class mansions there, which would have complied with the terms of the Act, and probably left them a profit; so that one of the objects in fixing the rent is to see that *working-class* dwellings are provided.

[The Witness is directed to withdraw.]

Ordered that this Committee be adjourned to Friday, June 6th, 12 o'clock.

Die Veneris, 6° *Junii*, 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN.	Mr. BOND.
Earl CARRINGTON.	Mr. CREAN.
Viscount GORDON (Earl of ABERDEEN).	Mr. CLAUDE HAY.
Lord HATHERTON.	Dr. MACNAMARA.
Lord WENLOCK.	

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN IN THE CHAIR.

MR. A. GRAY is called in, and Examined as follows:—

Chairman.

1060. You are standing counsel to the Lord Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords?—Yes, I am counsel.

1061. And, as I understand, it is your special duty to aid him in the administration of the various Acts of Parliament which come under his notice?—Yes.

1062. And with reference to this matter of the rehousing of the working classes who are displaced by any railway or other Act, you, I think, administer the Standing Orders more especially through the medium of clauses which are known as "model clauses"?—Yes.

1063. Will you just describe to us exactly the procedure which is taken with regard to these model clauses? They are, in fact, I believe altered from time to time by the Lord Chairman, and are intended to represent the spirit of the Standing Orders as they stand for the time being. Is not that so?—Well, as regards this question, they are. The model Bill is merely a collection of precedents for the use of the Lord Chairman and for the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, and for the agents in the preparation of their Bills; it shows the clauses which have been introduced, and which ought to be introduced, on a particular subject; and among those subjects is the labouring class clause, which is intended to represent the spirit of the Standing Order. I myself re-edit the model Bill at the close of every Session, putting in any amendments which have been decided upon during the course of that Session. Then the clause as it appears there is supposed to be introduced in the Bills of the next Session.

1064. The Lord Chairman himself has more to do with the amendment or alteration of the Standing Orders than anyone else, I think?—Yes, I think he is perhaps the only peer who in practice proposes any amendment of the Standing Orders.

1065. He submits them to the House?—He submits them to the House also at the close of every Session.

Chairman—continued.

1066. Then they are considered and approved by the House?—Yes; his further action is ministerial in carrying the Standing Order into effect.

1067. Now, it has been stated that occasionally there is some slight difference between the model Bill and the Standing Order. I suppose, if that is so, it is only accidental?—I think there is justification for saying that there is a slight difference between the Standing Order as regards the labouring class and the model Bill Clause. The matter has been brought before the Committee by Mr. Kershaw, and I might, perhaps, be allowed to refer to it. The Standing Order states that there shall be a scheme.

1068. The Standing Order of 1884 do you mean?—I am not dealing with that Standing Order of 1884, but the present one—the one now in force—1902. It provides that there shall be "a scheme for providing new dwellings for the persons residing in such houses, or for such number or proportion of such persons as the central authority shall, after inquiry, deem necessary, having regard," etc. Now the model clause follows these words to a certain extent. It says, "A scheme for providing new dwellings for such number of persons as were residing in such houses on the fifteenth day of December last."

1069. Will you just refer us to the section?—I have got the paper handed in by the Home Office. I am reading from page 6—that is, on the Home Office Memorandum. On page 6, in the paragraph "(a)," it says, "Shall have obtained the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to a scheme for providing new dwellings for such number of persons as were residing in such houses on the fifteenth day of December last, or for such number of persons as thethe Secretary of State shall after inquiry deem necessary." So I am bound to confess there is ground for the criticism that in the one case the Standing Order requires that the persons displaced are to be rehoused, and that the model Bill merely provides that dwellings shall be provided "for such number of

Chairman—continued.

persons as were residing in such houses"; but I must say that I do not think there is any difference of policy intended in the model Bill, because I have traced this question in the Bills, and I find that the present Standing Order was made—as stated in the Home Office Memorandum—in the year 1884. In the year 1885 I find, in the Acts of that year, a clause for the rehousing in exactly the same form as it is at present—that is to say, it does provide for "such number of persons," and not merely for "the persons"; so, whatever difference there is, is a difference due to the drafting of the clause merely—not to the intention; but I think it might be said that the words, "for such number of persons as were residing," might be taken to mean, "for the persons up to the number of those who were residing"—the number of *the* persons.

1070. An equal number of persons?—Yes, but of the *very* persons, up to the number of them that were residing in the houses.

1071. As a matter of fact, of course, the persons actually displaced are seldom the persons who are subsequently house?—Seldom, I understand.

1072. So that in operation the clause virtually would work out either way—either way in the same manner?—Of course, if the displaced persons are not actually rehoused, another class is housed—not the displaced class.

1073. But whatever the policy of Parliament may be, do you think it ought to be made clear in some way?—I think it ought to be made clear. On this point I would refer the Committee—as supplementing the Home Office memorandum—to the clauses which were introduced in Bills before the year 1884—that is to say, before the present Standing Order. I have got here a clause from a London and North Western Act of 1881; it is chapter 157, section 20. It ran in these words: "Before displacing any person belonging to the labouring classes who may for the time being be the occupier of any house or part of any house which the company are by this Act authorised to acquire, the company shall (unless they and such person otherwise agree) procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person: Provided always that if any question shall arise as to the sufficiency of such accommodation the same shall be determined by a justice." Now at any rate there can be no doubt about the meaning of that clause. It was a clause intended for the rehousing of the persons actually displaced. I have another clause—a clause of the year 1884, chapter 145, section 32—in a Lancashire and Yorkshire Act, which is in very much the same terms or a little more full: "Before taking in any parish 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partly by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, who may for the time being be the occupier or occupiers of any house or part of any house which the company are by this Act authorised to acquire, the company shall (unless the company and such person or persons otherwise agree) procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person or persons." Those were the clauses as they stood before the new Standing Order of 1884. Then in 1885, the clause introduced in the North

Chairman—continued.

London Railway Act, for instance, is almost exactly in the same form as at present, and was providing for such number of persons as were displaced. According to the evidence, as it has been given before the Committee, which goes to the effect that very few of the displaced persons take the new dwellings—to that extent it seems to me that both the Standing Order and the model clause fail somewhat in hitting the mark intended. The Standing Order at any rate does show an intention that the displaced persons shall be rehoused, and, so far as I can see, the evidence is that very few of them are. The only statistics given appear to be that in one case 30 of the displaced persons took the new houses out of 200 who had been displaced. The evidence also seems to show that the departments do not cease to endeavour to provide accommodation for the displaced persons by trying to bring the rents down to the level that would suit those persons, but it must be manifest that they do not succeed; so my suggestion is that the policy of Parliament should be made clear as to whether the persons actually displaced are to be rehoused or whether the provision should be a general one that the want of houses created by the demolition should be made good.

1074. Now if the duty of rehousing were limited to the persons actually displaced might not this happen—that the persons displaced might disappear, and what then would become of the obligation to rehouse if persons could not be found to put into the houses?—Yes, I am quite conscious of that.

1075. In the case of those Acts which you quoted to us before, where the obligation was made direct to rehouse the displaced, if the displaced were not found I suppose you do not know what happened under the Acts?—No; but I gather that those clauses which I read always provide that other agreements might be made between the company and the party displaced, and no doubt the fact that the party displaced went somewhere else and was no more heard of would be tantamount to an agreement that he did not want to be rehoused, so I suppose the question settled itself in that way.

1076. Then these new houses, as you say, are frequently—or not infrequently—of a kind which is superior to the houses which were destroyed, and therefore possibly too dear for the persons who were displaced?—Yes; and at the same time, being new houses, I take it that they are quite good enough for the class of a social status just above that of the displaced class, and therefore of a class which is content to go into the new houses paying much less than what is called the economic rent.

1077. There therefore would be a great rush after them naturally?—Yes. I assume that is the way in which they get filled. And if the new houses are occupied by that class—a little superior to the displaced class—then the houses of those people would become vacant, and then I presume that the labouring class displaced would be inclined to take those houses; perhaps they would get them at rather a cheaper rate than their predecessors.

1078. In your opinion then the real intention of

Chairman—continued.

of the Standing Order throughout the whole previous history of the question has been to rehouse those who were actually displaced?—I think undoubtedly.

1079. And what is your own opinion, speaking individually, with regard to that as contrasted with the effect of the present law, of which you have just been speaking, which is to house a different class and rather interfere with the economic rents?—Having regard to the consideration that it is impossible to compel the displaced to go into the new houses, I think probably Parliament must be content with the general improvement of housing all round which is effected by putting up a building to replace the houses that are demolished. I would say that the question becomes one of very great difficulty owing to the great means of communication at the present day; for instance, if houses are to be demolished in the parish of Camberwell and a new block of houses put up there, quite a number of persons will flock there from Brixton and other places for the benefit of getting new houses at a cheap rent—people, perhaps, who have got nothing to do with the industries of Camberwell.

1080. Then do you think that the clause requires redrafting, and that the Standing Order requires amendment?—I do not say so much about the Standing Order, because I think it is quite sufficient in the Standing Order to give a general indication of policy; but if the policy is to be that the displaced people need not be rehoused, but merely house accommodation provided in place of that which is taken away, then I think the Standing Order ought to be amended. Then I certainly am of opinion that the model clauses ought to be redrafted. I think they are unsatisfactory in many ways.

1081. Then would it not be possible to do that at the end of the Session as has been done on previous occasions?—I think so; yes. I have considered, of course, the amendments that have been prepared to be handed in, proposed by Mr. Troup, of the Home Office, and although I do not bind myself at all to the precise drafting, I think they form quite a good basis for redrafting the model clause. I take it that Mr. Troup's intention was rather to show the lines on which he thought the clause ought to go than to bind himself to specific drafting.

1082. These clauses are really of so general a character that, when once settled, it would appear that they ought to be inserted in every Bill?—Yes, they are inserted in every Bill. The model clauses are now (one of the model clauses, rather, is) inserted in every Bill in which provision is made for taking land.

1083. And always in the same terms?—Well, it depends; if they take less than 10 houses, of course the short clause is put in; then, if it is in London, the London clause is put in; if it is in the country, the country clause is put in; but once we look at a Bill we at once can tell which clause is to be inserted.

1084. Have you any opinion yourself as to whether this question of rehousing the working classes might be made the subject of a separate public Act?—I am of opinion that the time has now come when it would be very advantageous to have this settled by public Act. It would get over a good many of the difficulties which have been raised in the evidence given before this Committee, for instance, the difficulty suggested, I think, by Mr. Troup, of a company proceeding under two different Acts, taking less than the number of houses under each, and so evading the Standing Order and the clauses. If the whole question were dealt with by public Act it would be quite easy to draw the clauses of the public Act so as to apply to every taking of land by every company having statutory power. Moreover, I think, if I may be allowed to say so, that Parliament hardly sufficiently feels the responsibility it has for its private Bill legislation, and it would be a great advantage, I think, if Parliament followed and supervised the working of a public Act to deal with this question; and in the second place, as the noble Lord has just remarked, the matter is one already of general legislation, inasmuch as the clause is put into every Bill in which there is provision for taking land; therefore it is of universal application, and therefore, I think, proper to be dealt with by public legislation.

Chairman—continued.

1085. Is there any other point to which you would like to draw the attention of the Committee?—There is only one small point, it is, perhaps, hardly worth calling attention to; it occurred in the evidence of Mr. Byrne, Question 321 (he was asked this question by your Lordship): "I see that discretion is given to him in the long clause" (that is the Secretary of State). "It says 'or for such number of persons as the Secretary of State shall, after inquiry, deem necessary'; so that would cover, or might cover, a case in which he required a large number to be rehoused"? The answer is: "Yes, but the Secretary of State has never required a larger number to be rehoused. He has allowed a larger number to be rehoused, because in one or two cases the company have desired to provide a surplus of new dwellings." I think it might be useful to point out that I think it tolerably clear under the model clause that the Secretary of State would not be entitled to require a larger number to be rehoused. The words are: "for such number of persons as were residing . . . or for such number of persons as the Secretary of State shall, after inquiry, deem necessary," I think it must be considered as meaning "for such number less than the whole number." That is the only point I desire to add.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1086. With regard to your proposal about a public Act instead of the form of model clauses in private Bills, do I understand that the Act would broadly deal with something in the nature of the existing model clause?—I should presume so.

1087. Modified along the lines you have suggested?—Yes.

1088. Would it include anything else?—That would depend entirely on the policy of Parliament.

1089. I know; but I am asking for your view?—I was

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

—I was only dealing with this question as dealt with in the Standing Order at present.

1090. And dealing with matters which would arise in connection with companies coming to Parliament for powers?—Yes.

Mr. *Crean.*

1091. You read the old clause that was anterior to 1884, which definitely laid down that the parties disturbed should be rehoused?—Yes.

1092. The present one would you interpret in the same light, do you, or on more general lines?—I think it is more general.

1093. It might mean more?—It might mean the one or the other.

1094. It is not definite enough?—It is not definite enough.

1095. Then if Parliament should so decide, to either make it definite that they should rehouse the people disturbed, or make it broader still, to insist that only the number of houses disturbed should be placed there, and that they should do as they liked with them, there would be the necessity then to alter the clause?—There would be the necessity to alter the Standing Order.

1096. The Standing Order I mean?—Yes.

1097. You, of course, yourself would not offer any opinion upon that; that is a matter for Parliament itself?—That is a matter for Parliament itself.

1098. Can you give us any idea why it was the change was made to make it more general in its reading?—I have no knowledge. The clause was actually drawn by my predecessor, Sir Joseph Warner.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1099. Have you found that material importance is attached to this subject?—Oh, very much on the part of railway companies.

1100. Do you find that the suggestion, that it is a small matter, is one which you could endorse in your official experience?—That it is a small matter?

1101. Yes?—No, by no means; but you will understand, of course, that we have nothing to do with the working out of the schemes or orders; it is merely getting the clause into the Bills.

1102. It is a matter which is constantly before you?—Oh, yes; constantly.

1103. And excites a good deal of interest and attention in private Bill legislation?—Certainly.

1104. I did not quite catch your evidence in chief, but do I correctly gather that you think it is practically impossible to cope with the question as a whole by model clauses—that there must be public legislation?—I would not say that it is impossible to deal with it by clauses, but I think that the subject is full of so many difficulties that it would be advisable that Parliament should have it more directly under its control and supervision.

1105. In other words, the ramifications of this subject are so considerable that these model clauses do not really cover it, or cannot really cover it. In one sense, of course, they can cover it?—They can cover it rather better than a public Act, because the particular case can be provided for in the clause of a particular company—if there

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

should be any particular provisions necessary; but, as a matter of fact, the model clauses are hardly ever altered; they are considered of a most sacred character, and hardly any difference has ever been allowed, except in some one or two cases. As has been told the Committee already, in the case of one of the South-Eastern Bills there was a small variation allowed, but as a rule there is no alteration in these clauses at all.

1106. Have many inquiries been made of you in connection with alleged evasions by companies of their obligations, and therefore as to the necessity of strengthening the clause?—We do not hear anything of evasions until we are put in motion by the Department, with a view to altering the model clause for the purpose of getting round the evasion.

1107. You have so far been very successful in that direction?—Well, I cannot quite admit that.

1108. I mean the model clauses—taking your evidence in chief—in your opinion are not sufficient to cope with the evasions?—No, by no means. I think the evidence given by the Home Office and the Local Government Board has been to the effect that there are very few evasions now; but I think it is very difficult to carry out the policy of Parliament as to getting displaced persons rehoused. That is where the difficulty arises.

Earl of *Aberdeen.*

1109. You alluded incidentally, I think, to a case, where out of 200 displaced persons only about 30 took the houses provided?—Yes.

1110. I did not quite catch the full point. Would you repeat the particulars as to that?—It is in Mr. Kershaw's evidence.

Chairman.

1111. Is not it in a return that has been printed?—It is on page 47 of the evidence, Question 726, on the third day's evidence: "The only accurate record I have is of one case where 200 persons were displaced, and 39 of them went to the new houses—39 out of 200."

Mr. *Bond.*

1112. Might I take it that the impression left upon your mind with regard to the course of legislation has been this—that Parliament started with the benevolent intention of putting the people who were displaced into corresponding (or better) houses, and that, as a matter of fact, that intention was found for various reasons impossible of fulfilment, and that, partly consciously and partly unconsciously, we have now reached the stage when the obligation is considered to be discharged if the equivalent amount of accommodation is provided for persons of the labouring class, though the same people, or even the same class of people as those displaced, have not got into the new houses?—That is generally my impression.

1113. Then you suggested that there should be general legislation on the subject. I do not quite understand with what object that would be—I mean, why a public Bill should be brought in to deal with that matter?—That it should be taken out of the realm of private Bill legislation.

1114. That would not, of course, mean that you would

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

would convert private Bill legislation into public Bill legislation, but you would have a public Act dealing with this particular matter?—Yes.

1115. In what way would it deal with it in your view?—It would be quite easy to turn the present model clause into a public Bill commencing, "Where any body or authority takes land under statutory powers, then the following provisions shall take effect."

1116. "Shall be inserted"?—"Shall have effect."

1117. That is in effect what takes place now, is it not?—Yes, but the matter has to be considered in the case of every private Bill at present.

1118. It gives, as you pointed out, a certain possible advantage in elasticity of adaptation to the particular circumstances of the Bill?—As I pointed out, there is really no elasticity now, because the clause is settled.

1119. There is, at all events, a possibility of it?—Yes, it is amended every few years.

1120. I do not know whether it has been part of your duty—or, at any rate, part of your actual practice—to consider the effect of legislation of this kind?—No.

1121. I mean, it has not ever struck you, has it, that this particular attempt to compel the housing to follow a certain course has broken down, and that really, as a matter of fact, it is very unlikely to succeed to the extent which the framers of the clause expected, and that possibly it might be well to dispense with such legislation or such provisions altogether?—I think I have already stated that in my view the results of the rehousing policy must necessarily be of a very general character, inasmuch as they do not benefit the class who are intended to be benefited.

1122. You suggested, I think (I have heard the suggestion before), that though the new houses which the companies put up are not inhabited by the people displaced, but by a class more solvent and better able to pay high rents than those who are turned out, yet that the influx of people of that class into the new houses leaves other houses—the houses from which they have moved—at the disposal of the people who have been turned out?—Yes; that is a general presumption.

1123. Is that anything more than a conjecture?—Nothing.

1124. Have you ever known any instance in which it has really happened?—No; I think the evidence, as given to the Committee, on that subject seems not to be very definite as to what really happens with the displaced persons.

1125. Have you formed any view as to the policy which is pursued by the Home Office in certain cases of endeavouring to fix the rents of the new houses—as to how far that has answered the purpose which it is intended to serve?—No, I do not know sufficient about it to give any opinion upon that.

1126. I think you did say that the probable effect, at all events, would be that if you gave superior houses at a rent below the market rents

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

the people who were able to pay the market rent would run after those houses, and be quite as likely to get them as the people who could afford to pay no more than the rent prescribed under the Home Office direction?—Yes, that is so.

Lord *Wenlock.*

1127. You mentioned two companies—the London and North Western under their Act of 1881, and the Lancashire and Yorkshire, under their Act of 1883—having imposed upon them obligations to rehouse the people they displaced elsewhere. Was there any limit as to the distance in those days?—No.

1128. When did the limit first begin to be imposed by the Standing Orders?—The one mile limit you refer to?

1129. Yes?—That was imposed immediately after the new Standing Order of 1884.

1130. 1884?—Yes. That appears in the North London Act of 1885 in exactly the same terms as it is at present, "and working within one mile therefrom"; so that that provision has been in the clause all along since then.

1131. You cannot say, I suppose, offhand exactly what was the result of the Acts of 1881 and 1883 as regards the rehousing of the people displaced—how far they went?—No. The only information I have about that is contained in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1884, which is before the Committee, in which it points out how it was evaded at all turns.

Mr. *Crean.*

1132. There is a practice in the Home Office, as you know by the evidence, of fixing the rent of the houses for 25 years?—So I believe.

1133. The Local Government Board does not assume such authority at all?—No.

1134. Is the Home Office justified in doing it by the Act?—Well, I cannot very well tell at the moment whether it is within the Order, but they have the power to make a scheme. I should not like to say that the Home Office have not the power to do it; they have the power to make a scheme. I gather from *this* document that the London and North Western at least have questioned the power of the Secretary of State to fix the rentals.

1135. Then is it your opinion that there is a doubt?—I should think it was very arguable; it might be arguable.

1136. And if it were necessary to make such a provision for the fixing of the rent, do you think it ought to be changed in the Order?—Oh, undoubtedly. If the intention is that they should have the power to fix the rentals, I think it ought to be stated there.

Chairman.

1137. Is there anything else you would like to add?—No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. HUGH MANSFIELD ROBINSON, LL.D. (London), is called in; and Examined as follows:—

Chairman.

1138. You are a solicitor, and you are the Town Clerk of Shoreditch, I believe?—Yes, I am, my Lord.

1139. The Shoreditch Borough Council, I believe, has executed a scheme under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890?—Yes.

1140. So that this question of the housing of the working classes has been frequently before them, and also with reference to these two Acts under which some of the working classes are dishoused?—Yes; they have had practical experience of the working of this model clause, and also of the difficulties that arise in actually rehousing persons displaced.

1141. And I believe that the number of persons you house in Shoreditch is now larger than it was—is not that so?—Yes, it is; it has grown in the last 10 years.

1142. Has your population increased?—No, the population has decreased to the extent of 6,022 persons in the decade.

1143. And these houses have been taken out only by railway companies, but, I believe also by the School Board for London, as well as for private factories?—Yes.

1144. And has the number of persons that have been displaced by the School Board been considerable?—About 350 in one case—Gopsall Street Schools. Of course, we have not had many schools built lately in Shoreditch—I think that is the only one in the last 11 years. There were 350 persons displaced in that case, and neither the School Board nor anyone else has rehoused them, nor have any of the railway companies which have taken property in Shoreditch yet replaced the persons dishoused to my knowledge.

1145. Were they not under obligation to do so?—Well, the circumstances depend upon each case. May I take each case, my Lord?

1146. Certainly; but I am only dealing with the cases in which a displacement has taken place under Act of Parliament?—Yes. I believe the School Board should have rehoused these people; they were bound by their Act to do so; but recently a retrospective Act was passed upon that, requiring them to rehouse all persons displaced within the last five years, and that would seem to have dealt with these houses that were taken by them in Gopsall Street.

1147. Has your Council taken any action in the matter or called the attention of the School Board to it?—I got out a report upon the matter and laid it before the Council, and they sent a copy of it, I think, to the Home Office, and instructed their Members of Parliament to move in the matter; and it was soon after that, I think, that this clause was got in the School Board Bill making their action retrospective.

1148. When was that? What date was your report?—My report was dated the 13th September, 1900. It specially arose through Messrs. Waterlow and Sons taking 46 houses and displacing the people.

Chairman—continued.

1149. That was a private matter?—A private person.

1150. Those were private owners. My questions are all limited, please, to displacement which takes place under Act of Parliament?—Yes, my Lord.

1151. With reference to the School Board, my question had reference to the displacement which had taken place by the School Board, and which, as you say, has been treated through means of an Act requiring the School Board to rehouse all the persons they have displaced during the last five years?—Yes. I am afraid my Council have not agitated the School Board much; they have to find the School Board rate, and I suppose that this would be a heavy expense to them; and in addition to that they had a rehousing scheme of their own going on not very far from Gopsall Street; and as many of them are local managers of the School Board they did not press the matter.

1152. Have railway companies displaced many people in Shoreditch?—Yes.

1153. Have you any statement with regard to that?—Yes. Recently the London and North Western Railway Company acquired through a private agent some artisans' dwellings in Broad Street, known as the Broad Street Dwellings, just adjoining their goods station in Eldon Street; and their agent arranged on buying this property that the property, which was then occupied by artisans to the extent of 580 people, should be cleared, the people turned out—ejected from their tenements—and the property pulled down and handed over as a vacant site to the railway company, whereupon the company would no doubt later on promote a Bill to acquire the site to add to their railway station. They would thus have escaped the Standing Order requiring rehousing of the persons displaced. We had great difficulty in finding out who had acquired this site; it was only by setting a clerk on for nearly a week making inquiries that we found out the facts. Those buildings contained 580 people, of whom 379 were ejected under this arrangement before the 21st of January, 1902, whilst 33 other persons were given notice to quit, and some of the tenements were actually pulled down by the company—or rather by the owners of the artisans' dwellings by contract with the company's agent. But my Council then began to agitate upon the matter. When they found this property was going to be added to the goods station of the London and North Western Railway Company they said it was an evasion of the Standing Order, because, if the company had come up for a Bill they would not have been acquiring 20 or more houses *then* occupied by persons of the labouring class; they would then only have been acquiring the sites of houses which had been occupied by persons of the labouring class, and to which the Order does not yet apply. On the motion of the Member for Hoxton, who had been requested by the Council to strongly oppose the

Chairman—continued.

the matter, one of the London and North Western Railway Company's Bills was lost in the House in consequence of that action, and the company (under pressure, I believe, from the Home Office) thought better of their procedure, and have now undertaken to rebuild the dwellings demolished by them and reinstate the persons displaced; and in our opinion the Standing Order should be amended to cover such a flagrantly easy means of avoiding it as that.

1154. Have you a definite amendment which you could propose for that? You say it is very easy to avoid such an evasion; have you any definite amendment to propose?—I meant to say it was easy to evade the Standing Order in that way; that it was an easy evasion of the Standing Order. I do not think it would be very difficult to frame an amendment. I have a proposal for the amendment of the model clause which would deal with that.

1155. How would you propose to deal with it? Let us see?—It simply is an addition to the clause that I would suggest.

1156. Refer me to the clause, and the clause of the sub-section?—Page 85, clause 5, in the "labouring class houses," No. 11. No. 11 now is: "Any houses purchased or acquired by the company for or in connection with any of the purposes of this Act, whether purchased or acquired in exercise," etc. Those first words I propose should be altered in this way: "Any houses or sites of houses purchased or acquired by the company or their agent for or in connection with any of the purposes of their undertaking, whether purchased or acquired in exercise of the powers conferred by this Act or otherwise, and whether before or after the passing of this Act, which may have been occupied by persons of the labouring class within five years before the passing of this Act." If the words "or sites of houses" had been in that clause the London and North Western Railway Company would have been bound to rehouse in that case; and we propose to add after the words "by the company" the words "or their agent." That would provide for the case of a company acting by some agent—as many of the railway companies do—not always with the object of evading the Standing Orders, but because it is much more economical to buy through a secret agent very often than for the company to buy, acting openly.

1157. Then that is not the only case, I think, which has come under your notice, is it?—No, my Lord; there are two other cases. In fact, in the only cases we have had in recent years of railway companies taking artisans' dwelling, they have all been able to avoid the application of the Standing Order by very easy means. The case of the Great Northern and City Railway Company is very similar to the last one. This company, in the year 1898, promoted a Bill to acquire certain land in Poole Street, Hoxton, upon which there were 23 houses occupied by labourers—persons of the labouring class. The Shoreditch Vestry at that time petitioned against the Bill, asking for proper provisions for rehousing the 150 persons who would have been displaced. The company, for various reasons, did not proceed with

Chairman—continued.

the Bill, but soon afterwards arranged with their contractors (Messrs. Pearson and Company) to execute the line—practically as undertakers—taking the contract cost in shares and debentures of the company which was to be later formed; and under that arrangement the contractors acquired part of the scheduled site, which included these 23 houses occupied by 150 persons (the site scheduled being much larger); they evicted the tenants (of whom 150 were of the labouring class), used the vacant site as a depot for the construction of the railway and the removal of earth from the tube; and, having constructed the railway (it is nearly finished now), in the present Session of Parliament the Great Northern and City Company promoted a Bill to acquire this site as a vacant site for a generating station for their railway; so that the provisions of the Standing Order No. 38 would not apply to that case. The Borough Council opposed the Bill, and I brought these facts before the company, and pointed out that it was a very plain evasion of the spirit of the Standing Order, even if it was outside the letter, and they declined to do anything. We consequently lodged a petition against the Bill, and appeared by counsel, and they—finding that we were prepared to fight the matter, and that the member for Hoxton stated that he would oppose it upon its different stages in its passage through the House—offered, as a compromise, to contribute a sum of a thousand pounds towards the cost of the Borough Council in rehousing the displaced people in the suburbs; and as they had already inserted this model clause, as it stands, in their Bill, and we were not likely to obtain an amendment of that from the Committee, we thought it the best course to accept that offer, an offer which, no doubt, they made because it would probably have cost them that amount to have fought us through the different stages in both Houses; so they escaped with a contribution of a thousand pounds; whereas, if the Standing Order had been complied with it would have cost them not less than 5,000*l.* to acquire the land to rehouse these people in Shoreditch.

1158. Would it not have been necessary to comply with the Standing Order, or to comply with the model clause, which would have been embodied in their Bill; it would, would it not?—It was embodied, but it did not cover this case, because they were not taking houses which had been for five years prior to the Act occupied; they were taking sites of houses; therefore, owing to that small alteration not being made, they were outside the wording of the Standing Order.

1159. Have you made any calculation as to what the cost of rehousing a number of persons equal to the number of persons displaced would be?—Yes; I have calculated roughly; it came to 5,000*l.* to acquire the land.

1160. The land only?—Yes.

1161. Exclusive of the building?—Oh, yes; exclusive of the building. Land there is worth 20,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* per acre. That is what it cost us to acquire the Mortar Place area, and we have just bought a large area of three or four acres, called the Stonebridge Estate. It will cost us about the same amount there. That is in the most

Chairman—continued.

most northern part of Haggerston—the cheapest place for land in Shoreditch.

1162. You will also have to erect dwellings to accommodate this number of people too?—Yes.

1163. I suppose you are throwing that into your general scheme?—Well, the clause, as applied to us, was that these people were to be placed in the north-east suburbs, and we accepted that, as there was no time to consult with my council; but my council rather take the view that they should not house out in the country. My own personal view is that that will be the ultimate solution of the housing problem in places like Shoreditch. We find we do not get at these poor people. We only rehoused one person out of the 533 we displaced, the London County Council rehoused about the same percentage, probably, in their Boundary Street scheme, part of which is in Shoreditch; and we have come strongly to the conclusion that, unless we can buy land cheaper than 20,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* an acre, we cannot possibly build houses and let them at rents which will bear the enormous charges for repayment—the payment of interest and sinking fund. All that is an extra burden upon us as compared with the private speculator. We cannot in these circumstances hope to fix a rent which is within the means of the labouring classes.

1164. Then you apparently look forward to the utilising of electric tramways and suburban railways and other means of communication of that sort, I suppose, for this purpose?—Yes. It seems to me that when you get a tube railway, like this Great Northern and City, coming through the district, it must be a great relief to this housing problem in Shoreditch in opening up areas like Enfield, Gough's Oak, and so on, where there is plenty of space to build houses for the people; and having the trains to bring them in at cheap workmen's fares appears to me to be one of the best solutions of the problem. I quite recognise that this present clause is somewhat of a burden upon railway companies, because it means that they have got to pay twice the value for the land they acquire for their works. The London and North-Western Company would have had to pay 30,000*l.* an acre to rehouse those 500 persons they were about to displace; and that means a much heavier capital cost in constructing the railway; and I suppose that that heavier cost comes out of the pocket of the travelling public in the long run.

1165. Certainly. I suppose you would fall in with the suggestion which has been made to this Committee, that the area within which rehousing ought to take place ought to be enlarged, and should be no longer limited to the "parish," as it is at the present time?—Personally, I take that view, but I am afraid my borough council do not take that view; they do not like their people to go out of their own district, and so lose touch with them. It was a disputed question; there was equal voting upon the committee on this very question. On a visit to Bournville recently (that experiment near Birmingham) some of us were very much impressed with that splendid scheme of Mr. Cadbury's—especially for the sake of the children. The children's future I

Chairman—continued.

regard as of most serious importance in this matter. The question of whether a man has to wait about for an hour when he comes to business owing to a train getting him there earlier than he wants is, in my opinion, most infinitesimal compared with the fact of his children having to spend 24 hours a day in the slums, in bad atmosphere and under bad conditions.

1166. Is there any other case which you wish to lay before the Committee?—Yes. Another case in which this Standing Order would have been evaded was the case of the North-East London Railway Company, who, in the last Session of Parliament, 1901, promoted a Bill by which they would have acquired about 11 houses in Shoreditch, occupied by the labouring classes, for railway stations. This Bill was held over pending the general report of the Committee of both Houses, which was sitting at that time upon the Electric Railway Bills generally; and this year the company promoted another Bill—a new Bill—for acquiring a second site in Shoreditch for a generating station, where they would have taken 12 houses occupied by the labouring classes. Under both Bills they would thus have acquired more than 20 houses, but, as they would not have acquired so many as 20 houses under each Bill, the provisions of the Standing Order No. 38 would not have applied to them; and it was only owing to the fortuitous circumstance in that case that there was a strong opposing scheme to the North-East London and Piccadilly and City Bills (which were practically under the same promoters) by the Central London and District Railways, which made it advisable for the North-East London Railway to obtain the support of the Shoreditch Borough Council to the scheme, which was a very advantageous one for us; and they. quite without any obligation put upon them by these Standing Orders and model clauses, undertook to either amalgamate the two Bills or reduce the number of houses. I do not wish to suggest that that alteration—that division of the scheme into two Bills—was done on purpose to evade this obligation, but it had the effect of evading the Standing Order; and they said that was not their intention, but they would agree to amalgamate the Bills, or, if they were not amalgamated—if they were kept separate—they would reduce the number of houses in their model clause to 10 under each Bill, instead of 20. And one thing my council feel strongly upon this clause is, why this difference should be made with houses taken in London—that their minimum number should be 20, whereas in the country, where the housing problem is not so serious, the rehousing obligation has to begin with 10. We think, if anything, the figures should be reversed, because it is much easier to rehouse in the country, of course, than it is in London. The overcrowding abomination in London—certainly in the East End of London—is, I believe, far worse than any existing in any other part of this country.

1167. Is there any other case you wish to bring before the Committee?—There was one case, it hardly applies now, but several local authorities in London have had to displace persons themselves without having the legal power to rehouse

them

Chairman—continued.

them. We, ourselves, took 10 houses for baths and washhouses; my council were quite prepared to rehouse the people, but they had no power to do so.

1168. Have they power now?—Yes; under Part III. of the Act, which applies at the present time. Since November, 1900, they have had power to rehouse in these cases. But Bermondsey had a very glaring case; they took some houses for a dust destructor, and they were not able to rehouse, although they felt it was very necessary to do so. All these cases go to make the overcrowding very much worse. My experience is that these people, when they are turned out, go and overcrowd other houses in the immediate vicinity of the place they are turned out of; they generally move to somewhere near their work; they make a special effort to get houses near their work and near where they were before. The consequence is shown in the Census returns, which show that the number of persons per house has increased, though the number of inhabitants has decreased by over 6,000. I have made a suggested alteration, my Lord, in this draft model clause, an alteration that we suggest would meet all these cases. The alteration would meet the case of the North-East London Railway Company, where two Bills are promoted, neither of which takes more than 20 houses, whereas both together do; that would be met by altering Clause 5, sub-section 1. "The company shall not, under the powers of this Act purchase or acquire in any metropolitan borough or in the City of London, 20 or more houses or sites of houses." We suggest the alteration of the "20" to "10 or more houses or sites of houses," and this is an addition that we suggest to meet such a case, "or such a number of houses as will together with any houses or sites of houses authorised to be acquired by them under Act of Parliament obtained by them within one year previous or subsequent to the passing of this Act." Then the clause follows on as at present, "which on the 15th day of December last were, or have been since that day, or shall hereafter be occupied either wholly or partly by persons belonging to the labouring class." I can imagine numbers of cases in which it would pay the London and North-Western, and it would certainly be cheaper, to promote two Bills and acquire a small number of houses by each—which would not force them to rehouse—than to promote one Bill and bear the expense of rehousing all the persons displaced, especially where they have an omnibus Bill which they promote every year.

1169. Is it your experience that that sort of thing is often done? Have you personal experience upon which you speak—sufficient experience, I mean?—Only this particular case, and that put by Mr. Troup, I believe—another witness before you from the Home Office. That is the very case he put. Whether it was a suppositious case in his evidence or not I do not know.

1170. Of course, it is possible under the Standing Order as it stands; there is no doubt about that. Now, you have told us of an amendment which you propose—that not only the houses should be included but also the sites of houses: Can you suggest to us any other definite amendments on Standing Order 38?—You will find a clause at the bottom of page 83 which rather extends the power to houses "in some more open place or district." The following addition may be made to this sub-section: "If it shall appear to the said Secretary of State that having regard to the congestion of population in the immediate neighbourhood of the houses purchased or acquired by the company in respect of which new dwellings are to be provided, or for sanitary or other reasons it is desirable that such new dwellings or a portion of them should be provided in some more open place or district, he may approve of a scheme for providing the new dwellings or such part of them as he may determine in such other place or district as he may approve, and on such conditions as he may think fit, whether with regard to the provision of gardens, open spaces, and public recreation grounds, or to facilities of cheap communication or otherwise." In a district so densely populated as Shoreditch it is almost impossible to rehouse persons displaced without pulling down more property already occupied by the labouring class in the northern part of the borough or pulling down warehouses. You cannot find any vacant land in Shoreditch to any extent. We looked for some freehold land for a long time before we could find a site for a generating station; and it is now almost impossible to buy freehold land in Shoreditch that is not built upon in some way or other; and if a tube railway comes and opens up a new area and makes a low cost for travelling—giving cheap fares—I cannot help thinking that some such extension of the area for housing as is there suggested would be a relief, and a very proper relief, to the companies and would enable them to carry out these schemes without undue capital expenditure. Then there was another clause which we thought would be very helpful in these cases. We found this difficulty in the case of the London and North Western Railway Bill—that certain action was being taken by the Home Office as to which we were quite ignorant, and we were only informed of it just in time to enable us to take any effective action upon it; and what we suggest is that, where a scheme is made by the Secretary of State, to this clause at the bottom of page 83 this short provision should be added: "Provided also that before approving of any scheme under this section the Secretary of State shall give notice of the provisions of such scheme to the Council of the Metropolitan Borough or the Corporation of the City of London, as the case may be, in whose area the houses or sites of houses proposed to be acquired are situate, and shall take into consideration any representation thereon made by such Council or Corporation within one month from the receipt of such notice." That would be very useful in a case that is going on now in Shoreditch. We are rehousing. We shall be building model dwellings to rehouse about 3,000 persons; and if the Home Secretary were going to make a scheme without our knowledge as regards what he was going to do there, he might make a very different scheme if he had had that

Chairman—continued.

knowledge—that is to say, if we were able to make representations as to the best place for the scheme to take effect.

1171. I suppose as a rule you do receive notice, do not you, from the Home Office of anything of that kind going on?—We have never yet had a scheme made. All the companies who have displaced the labouring classes in our district have managed to evade their obligations under these Orders in the way I have stated; they have never submitted a scheme; it is a dead letter so far as Shoreditch is concerned, although the clause has been in the Bills.

1172. As I understand what you ask for is that notice should be given to you, and that any representation that you make should be taken into consideration; you do not ask that your approval should be required?—No; I put it like that; I am sure the Local Government Board or the Home Secretary would give consideration to it if there was anything in the representation; and they are the authority under this model Order; but we are rather in a difficulty as to who is the central authority in London—whether the Secretary of State or the Local Government Board; there is very grave doubt as to who is the proper authority. Under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, Part III., I do not know really to whom we ought to go for approval of a scheme to get compulsory powers to purchase some of the interests in this Stonebridge Estate that we have taken.

1173. So far as this inquiry goes there does not seem to be much difficulty; at least so far as I have heard the Home Office appear to act for London and the Local Government Board for outside London?—The Local Government Board act for London as well. They both acted on our Part II. scheme. We had to go to the Home Secretary to hold the inquiries; we gave all the facts and figures to the Home Secretary's Inspector; then when we came to carry out the scheme we had no less than four separate inquiries by the Local Government Board.

1174. That was under a different Act of Parliament, was it not; that was not on the question of rehousing?—Yes, through the local authority.

1175. With regard to that Standing Order, No. 38, which is the Standing Order before us, there is no doubt as to who the central authority is there, I think?—Yes, quite so. That is quite clear.

1176. Is there anything further you would wish to say to the Committee?—I think those alterations I have suggested in this model Order cover all the points, my Lord, that I want to put before the Committee. There will be consequential alterations in the Standing Orders themselves in order to make them coincide with these.

1177. Those are your suggestions?—Yes.

1178. There is one other matter. You spoke of the London and North-Western proceeding to act through their agents, and thereby evading the operation of the Standing Order; I presume you would wish words to be inserted so as to include agents and principals, if that is not already done by existing legislation?—Yes. I have suggested the words "by the company or their agents"—really, in law it ought to be the same thing, because what you do by an agent you do by yourself; that is a legal maxim.

Chairman—continued.

1179. I should have thought myself it would be so without knowing?—Except that it does not come within the exact terms of the Order.

Mr. *Bond.*

1180. Could you give me the name of the owners of the Broad Street houses?—The Lands Securities Company.

1181. As mortgagees, I suppose?—They have gone into liquidation.

1182. It is suggested by you, I think, that it might not be a bad plan if the Standing Order were so amended, or the practice were so amended, as to allow people displaced under the Companies' Acts, or Acts of a similar kind, to be housed in the country instead of in the immediate neighbourhood of the houses taken?—Yes; it seems to me that such a clause as that would prevent these manifest efforts to dodge this Standing Order, which, I have no doubt, are due to the very heavy pecuniary obligations involved.

1183. Yes, that is one side of the question; but upon the other there would be no means of obliging the people who were displaced to go into the country?—No, there would not.

1184. As a matter of fact, do you think they would?—If the houses were built first, and there was a tube adjoining, I think it is very probable that they would; that is the tendency. The number of men who come into Shoreditch by the Great Eastern Railway is perfectly surprising.

1185. Is it not within your knowledge that a great deal of cottage building is going on at Enfield and other places more or less accessible to Shoreditch?—The Great Eastern Railway only goes down to the south-east corner of Shoreditch, and it takes as long to walk from the remote end of Shoreditch to the Great Eastern Railway as it does to come from Enfield to Shoreditch.

1186. How far would that be?—It is a little over a mile.

1187. There are trams, are not there?—The trams go slower than you can walk through Shoreditch. There are 30 routes upon one set of rails—30 different tram routes; they keep converging on to a single line, and it is quite ridiculous to rely on the tram facilities in Shoreditch.

1188. According to your experience, I understand, if people are displaced, whether provision is made for them or not, they do not go out into the country; they disperse themselves or crowd themselves into houses in the immediate neighbourhood?—Yes. Enfield is getting built up; the houses at Walthamstow and Enfield are getting high rented. We want new areas like Waltham Abbey. The district round there is where the new North-East London Railway is going. If you can get land like that you get cheaper rents; the land is cheaper.

1189. Would not the advantage of those cheaper rents be outweighed, or more than outweighed, by the inconvenience of having to travel a considerable distance to your work, and by the

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

the fact that to be transported from your house to your work costs you a good deal of money?—Well, sir, I know, as a matter of fact, it is as cheap, and that it is as quick to come from Enfield as it is to go from one end of Shoreditch to the other by tram; that is to say, it costs 2d. there and back to Enfield by the Great Eastern Railway, and you can do it in the same time and at as little expense as you can if you go by tram from one end of Shoreditch to the other; it takes you just as long to get to the City to your work; so I cannot imagine the workman having a family—a wife and children—having any objection to go out into the country when he can get as quickly and cheaply to his work.

1190. How far is it from one end of Shoreditch to the other?—The tram comes in a circular way down the Hackney Road, and it would take him 20 minutes to walk to get from the north end of Shoreditch down into the City.

1191. Does not it occur to you that a man living in the midle of Shoreditch, a man who was working at one end or other of Shoreditch, might be prepared to walk to his work?—Yes.

1192. He could not walk to Enfield?—No, he could not, but they go on trams a good deal. They are all as lazy as any of them dare to be, I suppose, and they do not get up earlier than they need, and therefore they want to get in the quickest time they can to their work; that being so, the trams get so overcrowded that you cannot always get on the trams; so, I presume, they use the trams largely.

1193. May I ask you a question about the Stonebridge Estate? Do I understand that the Shoreditch Corporation bought that at the rate of about 20,000*l.* an acre, or less?—It will work out to about 20,000*l.* to 25,000*l.* We have only bought the ground rents subject to leases which will fall in in about 11 years. We are waiting to acquire the leases. We want to go for compulsory powers, and there is a doubt about which is the authority—the Home Secretary or the Local Government Board.

1194. You are trying to acquire the leases now?—Yes, we are negotiating for them.

1195. Is that for a housing or a rehousing scheme?—It is both a housing and rehousing scheme. The ground is covered. As I said, you cannot find vacant land in Shoreditch; the land is already covered with small cottage property of two storeys. We have bought the ground rents, and if we can cover the ground with five-storey houses, one above the other, we can accommodate twice the number of people that are there now. That is the only way we can either house or rehouse in Shoreditch.

1196. May I ask you the object the Corporation had in going in for this scheme?—The property came into the market; an area of about 153,000 feet came into the market; it was put up for auction. I advised my Council that this was a good opportunity to get a cheap housing scheme. It has worked out very much more cheaply than the Moira Place area scheme, where we had to buy up all sorts of interests—interests where people had leased buildings, started businesses, and so on, while we were negotiating, and in that way the cost was very much

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

increased. We bought this estate by a secret agent; it was not known until the agent had settled that it was we who had bought it. This was under Part III. of the Act, the first case we tried.

1197. That policy is rather against your view—that it would be better for the people to live in the country—is it not?—Yes; we had not seen the necessity then; in fact, the Act was not passed which enabled us to go out to house in the country; the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1900, I think it was.

1198. What is your obligation to people who live out in the country? I do not quite understand. If you build houses in the country and people occupy them they need not necessarily be inhabitants of Shoreditch, need they?—No; we could limit the letting to tenants in Shoreditch very well. The London County Council adopted that policy; they have got a Tottenham scheme, which is ideal from our point of view. This tube—the North East London Railway—will go into that area. They are outside the county. They will be able to house much more cheaply.

1199. If I remember rightly, the Tottenham scheme has not come into operation yet?—No, it is in course of building; they are getting out the plans; the plans are in existence.

1200. It is not known therefore whether the people who will live on the Tottenham estate will be persons for whom the London County Council had any responsibility whatever?—No. I believe many of the people living on the Boundary Street scheme will go out there—that is my firm conviction; they are all groaning under the heavy rent they have to pay there, and if they can find accommodation out there and get to it by a tube cheaply, I believe numbers of them will go; I know some of them will from what they have told me.

1201. Just one question with regard to the variation of the Standing Order by the introduction of "sites" as well as "houses." It would have to be "vacant sites of houses," would it not, because there might be a perfectly *bonâ fide* case of workmen's cottages having been cleared away and replaced by warehouses before the railway (or other) company came upon the scene at all?—Yes, that would be reasonable, I suppose—"vacant sites of houses." I meant them to be "vacant."

Earl of *Aberdeen.*

1202. You mentioned with regard to the first of the three railway cases you spoke of that the railway company undertook to rebuild dwellings for those that had been removed?—Those they had pulled down. There were three big blocks; they pulled down half one block, prematurely, as it appeared, and now they are going to rebuild that and reinstate the tenants; but whether that is only to get over the time their Bills are in Parliament or not I cannot say; I imagine it is not a permanent arrangement; they have still got the property; they have not sold it again; and I have no doubt they will use it for their station as soon as things are calmed down a little.

1203. They have undertaken to rebuild?—

Earl of *Aberdeen*—continued.

They wrote to the Home Secretary and said they intended to rebuild for the present.

1204. With regard to the Great Northern and City Railway transactions, would you advocate that method which was eventually adopted—I mean the contribution of a certain sum of money by the railway company to the council for the purpose in view?—I think it would be welcomed by the railway companies in order to get rid of that obligation; but perhaps your Lordship remembers that the London and South Western Railway Company, in building a block of model dwellings as required under their Act, found the loss to be such a burden that they handed them all over—the land and the buildings—to the local authority to get rid of the obligation.

Earl *Carrington.*

1205. I think you told us that freehold land in Shoreditch is practically not to be obtained?—Except at rare intervals.

1206. At very rare intervals?—Yes.

1207. What price per acre would land acquired compulsorily fetch?—30,000*l.* an acre.

1208. 30,000*l.* an acre?—We have paid at the rate of that for two sites ourselves. I know another site that was bought by Carter, Paterson's, which cost that. That is on the southern part, nearer the City; but up in the northern part—the cheapest part—it would run to 20,000*l.* to 25,000*l.*

1209. You are aware, are you not, that the London County Council cannot afford, without putting a charge on the rate, to pay more than 10,000*l.* an acre—that is 5*s.* a foot?—That is a figure I have calculated as the rate we ought to buy at, to house properly.

1210. Without putting anything on the rates?—Yes.

1211. I think we can take it from you unhesitatingly that you say it is very easy for railway companies to avoid the Standing Order?—Yes, most simple.

1212. You have given us three or four instances of what Lord Aberdeen has referred to?—Yes.

1213. Should not the area within which the limit of 20 houses should operate be the County of London rather than the area of each Metropolitan borough?—The area within which the limit of the 20 houses should operate should be the whole County of London; but I would sooner have it myself outside the County of London from the point of view of the children.

1214. I only ask you: Do not you think it had better be the County of London rather than the area of each Metropolitan borough?—Oh, yes; I quite agree that there is no object in making an artificial boundary in a Metropolitan borough, except that the local authorities who are interested in the buildings are more likely to look after them if they are in their own district than they would be if they were in the district of another authority that has had nothing to do with the scheme up to that time. That is one reason why I think it would be better to keep them under the Act as the authority to deal with the schemes.

1215. You see no objection?—No, not if the Home Office had to send the scheme to the local authority. At present they do not have to do that.

Earl *Carrington*—continued.

1216. Should not the London housing question—whether within or outside the county—be supervised by a central authority, such as the London County Council?—It might tend to co-ordination and so on; but there is so much to be done that I do not think, if each of the borough councils operated as hard as they can, they will really overtake the overcrowding for some time. If they were overlapping and building more houses than were necessary, one could see the great advantage of a central authority to prevent overlapping; but there is no fear of that. We are apparently the only local authority that has laid out a housing scheme, because of the difficulties in the way; and we are only a thirtieth part of London.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1217. You have given a good deal of attention specially to the subject of housing as a whole, have you not?—Yes.

1218. Is your experience, not only in London but from information which you have gained as to places outside London, that though the displacements by railway companies do not total up to very large figures, nevertheless they dovetail into displacements by the Home Office, the London School Board, and so forth, and altogether in an overcrowded district make the question of dishousing a very serious social evil?—Yes. I have shown that the total for Shoreditch is about 6,000 persons displaced in 10 years.

1219. Then in reference to the particular cases you cited of the London and North Western Railway in Broad Street, the Great Northern and City in Poole Street, and the North East London Railway in the other two places, did you find that you had much active assistance, as representing the Borough Council of Shoreditch, from any central authority in resisting the action of these companies?—No; on the contrary we had to take all the action, and to urge them to take action.

1220. Did the London County Council give you any assistance?—None whatever.

1221. Did the Home Office give you any assistance?—No; they did not even inform us of the negotiations passing between them and the company at the time these houses were being taken and the people displaced.

1222. Then you are not able to confirm the opinion expressed on behalf of the Home Office—that they do not think the evasions are appreciable. Your experience rather tends to the contrary?—I believe a great many evasions take place that are overlooked.

1223. Never heard of at headquarters?—Never heard of. *These* cases would never have been heard of, and therefore no notice could have been taken of them, because in point of fact they did not come under the Standing Order; all these cases would have passed through Parliament but for the vigilance of my authority who are very much impressed with the seriousness of this question.

1224. Do you feel very strongly, as an executive

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

tive officer under the Public Health Act, that this matter affects public health very much, and that on that ground the local authority should have, not merely a copy of the scheme sent after it has been thoroughly known and digested, but should have the earliest possible information of any proposed scheme by a railway or similar company put forward in a private Bill?—Yes, certainly; of course they are the best judges of these things; a central authority would not be.

1225. Not only that, but would it not assist you in the question of price and basis? When schemes are in contemplation do not various questions assist the price to become inflated?—Yes, it is very necessary that there should be some co-ordination of a local kind. I know now that the London County Council had this Stonebridge Estate under consideration at the same time that we had, and they might have been bidding against our agent; and all the authorities might have been bidding against each other. I took care to inform some of their officers that we were considering the question of bidding there.

1226. Now, in regard to a question addressed to you by Mr. Bond as to whether there was any desire on the part of the working classes of Shoreditch to find homes in the country, do you find that there is such a desire—a growing desire?—Judging from the large numbers of work people who come in on the cheap trains I think it is clear there is. A great many of them generally have to stand up. They are treated more like sardines in a barrel than anything else; and most inconvenient the trains are because they are so very greatly overcrowded. I think the consequence is, that if they were made a little more convenient for them they would go out into the country; very many of them have to wait about for an hour before their work begins owing to the absurd hours fixed by the railway companies for running the workmen's trains.

1227. In other words if you had a rapid system of trams and tubes you think a very large amount of this population would take advantage of better homes on the outskirts of London?—Yes, I feel sure they would.

1228. Therefore you favour the local authority agreeing with the railway company—or other promoter of a private Bill, to some financial arrangement rather than the hard and fast carrying out of the rehousing obligation actually contiguous to the displacement?—Yes, I do.

1229. Now with regard to the Broad Street case did not a certain number of the evicted tenants show a desire to go to the country?—It was rather curious. One tenant there whom I was cross-examining upon this question said he had been out to Walthamstow, and had actually come in again to live in London, so that he had had the contrary experience.

1230. What was the reason for that?—He said it was near his work. The trains were not very suitable I think for him.

1231. It was a question of trains?—Yes, but I think he was going out again there when he was displaced.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1232. Did you ever ascertain from any of the tenants displaced that having gone, say, to Tottenham under present conditions in consequence of their eviction from Broad Street, they found the train service such that they were forced to return to Shoreditch and overcrowd the houses there because they would have lost their employment if they had continued at Tottenham?—No, I am bound to say I did not trace those who went away from there. A man I saw there just before the eviction told me he had come from Tottenham to live at the Broad Street Dwellings.

1233. Do a number of the population there work in Shoreditch, or do a great number of them work outside?—Oh, large numbers work outside.

1234. Therefore the question put by Mr. Bond, that a workman working in Shoreditch could walk to his work in Shoreditch would not really meet the whole case, would it?—No, it would not.

1235. Many of them would be worse off under that arrangement?—Numbers of them are in the building trade and move about a good deal.

1236. Now in regard to the question of private Bill legislation being insufficient, you have given a good deal of attention to the subject of the various laws affecting this question, have you not?—Yes, I have.

1237. Are you of opinion that it could best be dealt with by a public Act, and that private Bill legislation, Standing Orders, and model clauses are not sufficient?—Yes, I think it would be very useful to have a public Act. It costs my Council money every time to instruct Parliamentary agent and counsel to appear in these cases before Parliamentary Committees; it costs about a hundred pounds in each case.

1238. And you have to watch every case of private Bill legislation which directly or indirectly may affect you?—Yes, and it occasions a great waste of official time—at least a great consumption of official time.

1239. Now is it your opinion that it would be difficult to obtain sufficient evidence as to what happens to displacedpersons?—It is very difficult. I had all the people on the Poole Street site followed up two years after they had left, and I found that it took a fortnight to trace them; they were scattered (some were in the district close round—others at Brixton) all over London.

1240. In other words, such evidence as is obtained, in your judgment, does not reveal the extent of the displacement and the trouble caused?—No, it is very difficult to find out where a man has gone two years after he has left the place.

1241. My last question is this: You are satisfied from your experience, extending over a number of years in Shoreditch, and from a very close study of this question of housing in Shoreditch, that these displacements have very seriously increased the crying evil of overcrowding in Shoreditch?—Yes; I do not know how else to account for it, though, of course, the private factories have helped.

1242. That is your opinion, rightly or wrongly, from the point of view of industrial efficiency, public

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

public health, and so forth?—Yes. I have visited many of these people in their own homes. In many cases girls of 13 or 14 were sleeping with boys of 15 or 16, in the same beds; and for such accommodation as they had got the rents were high and were continually going up; I have known lots of cases in which the rents have been increased three times in six months.

1243. Do you find immigration make any appreciable effect upon this question in Shoreditch?—Yes, some of the foreigners are coming in. One rate collector told me he had to employ an interpreter to get his rates from the occupiers of one large block of buildings; and they, of course, will pay higher rents than anyone else because they manage to live almost on air.

Lord *Hatherton.*

1244. Have you no powers to prevent overcrowding?—We have powers to evict the people and put them into the street; then they go to the workhouse. It practically amounts to nothing in the end.

Mr. *Crean.*

1245. You stated that the Act calling on the School Board for your district to rehouse has not been carried into effect by them?—Well, I cannot remember offhand whether there was a clause in that Act; I believe there was no model clause in that Act.

1246. But you said they had undertaken to do it?—I understood that in a recent Act it had been made retrospective, to cover cases like that, but we did not watch the Bill at the time, and I regard the School Board as more or less a kindred body to ourselves—representing the ratepayers; and, of course, it is a very heavy obligation to saddle the School Board with this rehousing. They would have to go for a site for the rehousing which would make it equal to paying for sites of two schools, and that would make it very expensive.

1247. You complain of the action of the central authority (which in your case you are in doubt about) in carrying that out?—Yes; we say so. What has the central authority done? They have either left the model clause out or they have failed to see it carried out.

1248. Do you make it your business on all occasions where this kind of thing comes under your notice to communicate directly with the Home Office?—Yes; I brought this case of the railway company under the Home Office's attention.

1249. And did they immediately take action when you drew their attention to it?—They raised the question in the House upon a Bill—at least, upon a question put by the member for Hoxton the Home Secretary became acquainted with the facts, inquired into them, wrote to and got an answer from the company. One of the companies did not give him a true answer in one case (that is the Great Northern and City) which was put by the Home Secretary; they said that the houses were closed as insanitary. They were not. They were nothing of the sort; and if sanitary notices had been served upon the owners the

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

defects could have been put right for a few pounds; but not one of those houses was closed for sanitary reasons. That was a misrepresentation.

1250. If the Home Office were in proper touch with you with reference to all demolished houses in Shoreditch, do you think the present overcrowding could possibly occur?—It would be very much alleviated, no doubt.

1251. Has not that something to do with the raising of the rents—the demolishing of the houses and nobody taking any notice of the raising of the rents of the slum houses?—Certainly; we know of Jewish syndicates coming and buying a whole row of houses and putting up the rents a shilling a week three or four times a year. The tenants say, "We will go elsewhere"; they say, "Go elsewhere"; they tramp the shoe-leather off their feet going to look for houses; they do not find anywhere else they can go to; then they submit, and another shilling a week goes on to the rent. I have known the rent raised 3*s.* or 4*s.* a week within a short time quite recently. That causes a very bitter feeling amongst the working classes.

1252. You think this could not possibly occur if the railway companies or other bodies taking over these premises, either for a factory or for a railway, were compelled by the Home Office to carry out the strict rehousing obligation of the model clause?—It would naturally relieve the difficulty, because these people, when the rents were raised, would have somewhere else to go to; there would be more housing accommodation in the district.

1253. The alterations you suggest in the model clauses are in two directions—one that there should be communication between the local authority and the central authority as to all such schemes?—Yes; that is most important.

1254. And the other, I presume, that there should be a more definite description in the model clauses—and an insistence on the execution of this work; it is not definite enough at present?—No, it is manifest it is not definite enough, because it is so easy to get out of it.

1255. It is easy to evade it?—To evade it.

1256. By purchasing sites of houses that are within a recent time to be demolished?—Yes, or actually buying them by their own agent and pulling them down.

1257. You have given instances where that has occurred?—Yes.

1258. And you have suggested such alterations as would, in your opinion, meet the requirements?—Yes; they are very slight alterations, really, in this long clause, but I think they meet the case; this case we have had actual experience of. I dare say some clever lawyers would find a means of driving a coach and four through even those alterations.

1259. You have stated that in most cases the people disturbed by the demolition of their homes congregate in the immediate vicinity?—Yes.

1260. And so the neighbourhood becomes congested?—Yes.

1261. How

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1261. How many habitable houses have you in Shoreditch?—The inhabited houses in 1891 were 13,848; in 1891—10 years afterwards—it had sunk to 12,904, or a decrease of 944 houses in 10 years.

1262. Now what is the present population?—118,705 in 1901.

1263. 118,705 in 1901, with 12,904 houses occupied?—Yes; the average number of persons to the house was nine in 1891.

1264. May I put the question to you—What is the average number of persons to a house?—In 1901 it was 9·19—practically, 9 1-5th.

1265. Now, can you give me 10 years before that?—Yes. The average number of persons to a house in 1901 was nine.

1266. Therefore, it has slightly increased in that time?—Yes; it has slightly increased.

1267. You said, I think, that, although there had been demolition which would cover the case of 6,000 persons, in your estimate there had never been any compulsory rehousing in the Borough of Shoreditch?—No, we had not any artisans' dwellings erected by anybody but ourselves and the London County Council, and we did not house as many as we displaced. We displaced 533. The Local Government Board required us to rehouse only 400; we have actually rehoused 475 now, but we were not bound to.

1268. With regard to the 6,000 which represent the demolition, can you point out to this Committee, and can you tell me what is the proportion of that 6,000 as representing demolition from this cause, or that cause or some other cause?—Yes; about 350 persons were displaced by the School Board, 150 by the Great Northern and City Railway; Messrs. Waterlow and Sons displaced 500; and my authority displaced perhaps 100 that they have not rehoused.

1269. But they do not total up to your 6,000, do they?—No. Of course, the City is growing, outwards, and near the City in the Moorfields Ward, where most of this demolition takes place, numbers of large warehouses have been erected on the sites of small cottages; the small cottages are all pulled down, and big warehouses have been erected on the sites so cleared.

Chairman.

1270. Presumably, all the others would be represented by factories and private trade, and for private purposes?—Yes, within the last 10 years all those except those that I named.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1271. There has been no compusory rehousing; do you tell us that as a result of that the rents have gone up substantially in Shoreditch?—I know rents have gone up.

1272. I know that. I want to know the reason?—It is one of the reasons. The rents go up because there is insufficient accommodation, and this is one of the causes of insufficient housing accommodation.

1273. Could you give us any detailed statement as to the increase in the rents, or can you procure statistics?—I have got statistics that have come before me, and have had some very serious cases; as I mentioned, as much as three

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

to four shillings a week increase has been made in a year in tenements let at 11*s.* a week, and they go up to 15s.

1274. When that return is complete, could you forward it to this Committee?—Of course, I could go back further. It is only recently, I may mention, that we have had our attention drawn to this question, and that I have been watching these rents, but I could get out a pretty complete return of them from the owners' returns. We have the owners' returns of rents, and I could have those checked in a number of test cases, and just show the actual increase; but, of course, in the case of these cottage properties, the rents include the rates, and our rates have been growing of late years; and it is only fair to say that some of the increase in rents may be due to the increase in rates.

Chairman.

1275. You would not attribute the whole rise of rent—or anything approaching the whole rise of rent—to the removal of the working classes under Acts of Parliament, would you?—No, only a portion.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1276. Having regard to the fact that demolition is effected under Provisional Orders or Acts of Parliament, it does bear upon the rental of the dishoused. Perhaps you will prepare that statement?—Yes; I will have it looked to.

Chairman.

1277. And will you give, as far as you can, the proportion of removals which have taken place in the periods to which you refer under Acts of Parliament—just distinguish that from other causes—that is, so as to furnish an indication, so far as it goes, of what the rise is due to?—Yes.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1278. Now, with regard to the London School Board, it is Gopsall Street, I think, the school that you referred to?—Yes.

1279. In all, I think, the Board has demolished places to the extent of 350 persons in 10 years?—In the case of that one school.

1280. Is there any other in Shoreditch?—No; I am not aware that they have built any others.

1281. Do I understand you to say that we have demolished 350 artisans' dwelling places?—No—350 persons—there would be about 25 houses, or something like that.

1282. About 25 in the 10 years. Have you got the actual figures, or not?—I only went into it a couple of years after the school was built; therefore, we had to estimate it from the ordinary number of persons in a house in Shoreditch. The chief sanitary inspector gave me the figure as about 350.

1283. Have you got the number of houses with you that were demolished?—No; I am afraid I have not.

1284. Shall we say it was about 25?—Yes; I think it was about 25.

1285. You have said that in that case you think the School Board ought to have rehoused?—Well, my authority did not feel inclined to ask the School Board to spend more money; their

rate

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

rate is high enough already. That is just one of the cases which show what a heavy burden this is; they would have to buy another site as big as that of the school to rehouse all those people; therefore, it would have cost twice as much as it did.

1286. I think you said that, under Parliamentary obligations recently imposed, the School Board should have rehoused, but that the Borough Council did not press them because they were a kindred body. I think that is what you called the School Board?—Yes, that is so. We think the central authority should have looked after that. We do not go and oppose their Bills. We do not waste the ratepayers' money in opposing Bills promoted by another ratepaying authority, and so we left it in that case.

1287. You did not make any representations?—We did not make any representations.

1288. Are you aware of the present obligations which are laid upon the School Board? Do you know that in the year 1899 the Board came with a Provisional Order to this House in the Schedule of which there was a certain charge on the rates?—I think I have read that Order. There were five or six sites.

1289. Yes, there were several; but I am speaking of a particular site?—Yes.

1290. Do you know that it was pointed out that that site was part of a scheme in connection with the remainder of which the Board had already been to Parliament, and that by taking it in two parts—taking 19 houses, say, each time—it had thus evaded its obligation to rehouse?—Yes, I have heard that stated.

1291. Do you know that in that Provisional Order, and in connection with that particular scheme, it was decided to so far alter the Order as to make the obligation cumulative in regard to all parts of that particular scheme?—Yes, retrospective. That is the very case I was thinking of.

1292. Had that anything whatever to do with Gopsall Street?—No, nothing.

1293. Then in connection with anything in Shoreditch there is, and has been, no obligation upon the School Board for London?—I am not aware of any. I do not know why (I cannot explain why) the model clause was not put in their Provisional Order. We did not watch it, seeing that it was before these railway alterations and demolitions had drawn the Council's attention to this question as a very important one.

1294. May I take it that you now modify to that extent what you originally started out with, that in the case of Gopsall Street the School Board for London was under some Parliamentary obligation to rehouse?—Yes, I thought it ought to have been put in. I cannot say from definite knowledge whether it was or not, because I have not turned up the Provisional Order.

1295. Will you take it from me that the obligation to rehouse, to which you refer in general terms, was with reference to a particular Provisional Order and a particular site?—Yes, but I am not prepared to say that they did not have the model clause attached to Gopsall Street.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

1296. Of course they had the model clause, but I take it they took less than 20 houses in one year, otherwise they would have been compelled to rehouse?—But there were more than 20 houses here.

1297. Then I take it that possibly they took the scheme in two parts, but at that time there was no obligation to make it cumulative?—No, perhaps that is so.

Chairman.

1298. Presumably that would be so. Of course you have not got the Order before you so you cannot say?—No.

1299. But presumably it would be so, would it not?—Yes, I presume that would be so.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1300. Do you know that the policy of taking the schemes in two parts had been constantly adopted by the School Board and other public authorities from the very beginning?—What, for the purpose of avoiding this Standing Order?

1301. Yes. Did you know that?—I did not know that; I knew it had been done on one or two occasions; I did not know that it was general policy.

1302. Did you know that the taking of a scheme in two parts at that particular period—say, 1899—was no new method, no new policy of the School Board at that time?—No. Probably that is where the railway companies got the hint from.

1303. From the public authorities?—Yes.

1304. Let me ask you this further: Do you know that when the matter was brought specifically under the notice of the members of the School Board—that their custom from time immemorial was practically an evasion—the great bulk of them were sorry that the course had been adopted, and immediately put themselves in order, as promptly as they could?—They have not done anything yet to remedy this displacement in Shoreditch.

1305. I must ask you again whether it is not a fact that no obligation was laid upon them in respect to any site in Shoreditch?—Well, it was made retrospective in some of these Provisional Orders that you are speaking of. I noticed it was made retrospective.

1306. Five years?—If in other cases of Provisional Orders we were agitating to get that retrospective clause of five years we could get it, I suppose, to rehouse these people displaced at Gopsall Street.

1307. I do not know; but if it is a fact I hope you will. Now with regard to the Broad Street case—the London and North Western. On the Second Reading of the Bill of this year you will remember an undertaking was given (read by the Home Secretary), that the company would continue to use the land for artisans' dwellings purposes?—Not permanently. They were going to rebuild and restore them, but from inquiries I have made I think I am right in saying to the extent that it is only a temporary measure.

1308. I was going to ask: Do you know any means whereby the company could be compelled to carry out that obligation?—They would be compelled

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

compelled if this model clause was altered as I suggest, because when they came up for Parliamentary powers again they would get this clause put upon them.

1309. But as things stand at present?—As things stand at present they would not be bound to rehouse those persons.

1310. I think you have given us your private view—that the probability is that they will depart from this undertaking at an early date? —My inquiry officer was informed by the caretaker that he thought the buildings would come down in time.

1311. I think I gathered from you that the London County Council had not been particularly active in regard to the Broad Street case? —No, they did not move in the matter until the year after we had succeeded in getting the Bill defeated.

1312. The first Bill?—The first Bill. Then they began to move. I noticed it upon their agenda paper.

1313. You told us that in this second case of Broad Street—the further demolitions—the further ejections rather under this private treaty —the County Council had it upon their agenda paper and went into the matter?—Yes, they had, and they recommended, I think, the appointment of this Committee, and that it should be brought before them.

1314. Shall I tell you that I received from Mr. McKinnon Wood a very strong personal appeal, together with a very large number of documents which had evidently been before the County Council, hoping that what I could do I would do to see that the company carried out its obligations in regard to rehousing?—I should not be at all surprised. I know Mr. McKinnon Wood is very active on this question. That London and North Western Bill that was thrown out really did not touch these Broad Street Buildings at all. The question was raised by the Member for Hoxton upon that, and the throwing out of that Bill and the fear that it might happen again caused them in the next Session when the Bill was reintroduced to give way.

1315. The Broad Street case came up in connection with that second Bill?—No, there were laches by them at Euston in the district of the St. Pancras Borough Council.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1316. Not in the parish of St. Pancras, was it? —I know that an action was commenced against the London and North Western Railway Company, by the Home Secretary, to recover penalties in their case to the extent of 5,000*l.* in connection with works somewhere up in the north of London.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1317. On the Second Reading, which was carried, in the present Session, the Broad Street case came up in connection with that Bill?—Yes.

1318. It did not come up in connection with the first Bill?—It was endeavoured to be brought up, but I think the Speaker ruled it out of order. The member for Hoxton is here and he will remember.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

1319. It was because further ejectments took place—they were being continued at the time of the second Bill when the matter was brought up. I have asked you whether you are aware of the fact that the County Council went into the matter very fully and showed its desire to meet its obligations, in the one little way which I have described to you, by sending to me personally (and I daresay to a great many others) asking me to do what I could?—I do not wish to complain of the County Council; they probably did not know anything about it when we knew about it. That was the trouble: If the Home Secretary had informed them or the local authority, we should both have known earlier than we did.

1320. And they would have taken all means in their power to have dealt with it?—Yes, by opposing the Bill.

1321. With regard to the number of houses demolished before rehousing becomes obligatory, you can take 9 in the country or 19 in London. I think you suggested that the figures should be reversed—or at any rate, that they should not be able to take more than 10 in London?—Yes, we suggest that the clause as to London should be made the same as it is with regard to the country.

1322. Ten?—Ten, yes.

1323. Do you think that would be entirely satisfactory?—Of course it would be more satistory than the present arrangement, and I cannot conceive why the difference was made.

1324. Would you go the length of saying, having regard to the very great pressure of the statement you have made—the appalling statement—of the lack of proper housing accommodation in Shoreditch, that if a single working-class or artisan dwelling is demolished under powers which Parliament grants, that rehousing obligation should rest upon the authority or company securing the power?—No, I should not, and I really am at a loss to know why the railway company should be selected as the one set of people to rehouse.

1325. I am speaking generally of companies? —My council are in favour of extending it to large private demolitions like this one of Waterlow's.

1326. Now let me put the question again: Suppose a public company or public authority has to come to Parliament for power, would you in that case go the length of saying if they demolished a single house they should rehouse?— No, certainly not.

1327. You think the limit should be 10?— Yes, I think 10.

1328. You think that would meet the situation?—As long as 10 applies in the country I do not see why 10 should not apply in London. It depends upon the circumstances. If you were making a tube to open up new areas, that ought to be taken into consideration I think—that they are increasing the means of communication and helping to solve the housing problem in that way.

1329. But you are satisfied if you get it down to 10 for London?—Yes.

1330. You know the definition of "house" in the Standing Order?—Yes, it includes a tenement.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

1331. "For the purposes of this Order . . . the expression 'house' means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling." Have you any complaint to make of that definition?—No, I think it is very wise, because it covers the tenements which exist largely in Shoreditch; you may get one block that contains 20 houses.

1332. You treat it as a house?—Each tenement is a house.

1333. That is 20?—I read that clause as meaning that a tenement is a house. If there were one set of model dwellings that contained more than 20 tenements that clause would apply.

1334. Does the Home Office read it in that way?—I do not know that the question has ever arisen with them. Can it be read in any other way? Is not that what the definition says—that it shall include a tenement?

1335. No, certainly not. This is the Home Office memorandum:—"For the purpose of this Order . . . . the expression 'house' means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling?—Certainly. Well, it has been held in several cases upon the word "house" that "house" includes "tenement"; we rate them separately, we treat the tenements altogether as separate houses.

1336. You know the definition of "labouring class" in the same section?—Yes.

1337. Has any practical difficulty arisen in connection with that?—No; it is a little hard in getting out a list of cases to know exactly what is a "labourer." He is a man who works with his hands, I take it.

1338. You think the definition covers it?—Yes; I have not seen any difficulty in that.

1339. One other thing. You demolished some houses for your baths and washhouses, I gather?—Yes, we took 10 houses; at a later date we took four; we bought them by private agreement.

1340. That was before the Local Government Act of 1899?—Yes.

1341. Which Act conferred upon you the right to rehouse?—Yes.

1342. But when you did those you had no such Parliamentary powers?—In the case of the Stonebridge Estate I think we are able to rehouse them upon the estate, which is near the Balles site.

1343. In default of Parliamentary power to rehouse yourselves, did you represent the matter to the London County Council at all?—No, we did not; we did not want the obligation particularly put upon us; it would have made our bath site cost double.

1344. Now that you have the Parliamentary power, do I understand that you propose to use it?—We bought that big Stonebridge Estate, and we shal lrehouse 3,000 persons, in order there to try to make up some of the leeway lost in these cases of demolition.

Mr. *Crean*.

1345. I was examining you in connection with the effort of the parties or companies destroying the houses; I was asking you whether they made any effort to secure as tenants those who were

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

turned out?—Well, they have not rehoused in Shoreditch at all, of course. I know one case—a case of the Midland Railway Company—in the country whether they were required to rebuild the dwellings before they displaced the persons. That is the proper way to do it; then you have got the buildings ready for the displaced persons to go into.

1346. You think that would meet it—make it compulsory upon them to build houses?—Yes; I think that is the best way of doing it, if you can—to rehouse at the same time.

1347. Do you think the rent should be actually fixed, as is the practice of the Home Office Department?—That works a great hardship. I know of one case where the Midland Railway Company are forced to let houses at half-a-crown a room. We cannot afford to do that. Even where the County Council pays half the cost of the land, we cannot let under 3*s.*; so that the company must be losing, and are losing, very heavily.

1348. It was assumed they would lose; it was not for an economic purpose that they built the houses, but to meet the obligation imposed upon them by Parliament?—I suppose that was the rent before.

1349. Do not you think this would, to some extent, almost make it certain that the parties disturbed would get back into their homes again?—Fixing a low rent?

1350. Yes?—Oh, yes; that is a most important thing, of course.

1351. Do you think it would be advisable to extend this to the country districts outside London?—Extend the power of fixing rent?

1352. Yes?—I do not think it is wise to overload a railway company with capital expenditure. If you do that, you only have to pay it back in increased fares, and you prevent the working classes getting out into the country at a cheap rate. It is a question of policy for Parliament, it seems to me.

1353. That is not what I mean at all. The policy of Parliament, as interpreted by the Home Office, is that they have the right to fix rents that would accommodate the people disturbed?—That is most important, of course.

1354. Do you think it would be equally essential when people are disturbed outside the City or County of London?—Yes, just as important.

1355. If it applies to London, it should apply to all other centres of population, you think?—Yes; if you want to make the housing a success, it ought to be paying for itself. The London County Council and my own authority could not charge such rents; we do not provide dwellings at anything like the rents of those pulled down. We could not do it; we are pledged not to put anything to the sinking fund out of the rates.

1356. You think it is not advisable?—Yes.

1357. That is, if the provisions of this Provisional Order are really carried out in their entirety?—Of course, you must look at what property they turn out of.

1358. You think that either local authorities or railway companies, or any other companies which disturb them, should provide equivalent accommodation for the class of tenants disturbed, both

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

both in rent and accommodation?—That is what I take to be the policy of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, and we spoil that policy at present by not fixing the rents with any regard to what was paid before, but by piling up the charges for maintenance, and so on—repayment of debt and interest—and dividing that into each room, and saying "That shall be the rent you shall pay for these rooms whether you can afford it or not." In consequence of that we do not get the people we want to rehouse.

1359. Have you no power to fix the rent at a lesser rate to cover those charges?—We have power. The County Council have themselves resolved that they will not make a charge on the rates, but that they will make the dwellings self-supporting.

1360. Do they ever take into consideration the view that it is not equitable to charge the sinking fund as well as the interest on the tenant?—I advised my Council that it was illegal to charge sinking fund (I think it is absolutely illegal) on the rents under the policy of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, and it was held to be so in law by the Law Officers of the Crown in the case of small allotments. The question of gardens is naturally most important, but this question of housing of the working classes is a question of life and health. Why should not there be a charge upon the rates for a time, in order to let the tenants have the houses at a less rent? The rent which we charge the tenants is too high. This is what I told my Council: The tenants ought to be becoming the owners of the houses at the rents they are paying. They are paying the whole cost of the houses. I have given this evidence before the Committee on the Repayment of Loans; I think this question of sinking fund is the whole solution of this housing difficulty, and no other. If we were rid of this burden, which is not put upon a private company, we could do much better. We are actually making more interest out of our tenants than an Industrial Dwellings Company make out of theirs.

Mr. *Crean*—continued.

1361. So that in reality you are creating a capital for the borough out of the pockets of the poorest class of the community?—That is so.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1362. Were you Town Clerk or Vestry Clerk of Shoreditch at the time the Gopsall Street site was bought?—Yes, I remember going into the cost of the houses, because we rated them.

1363. Have you seen a letter addressed by the London and North Western Railway Company's solicitor to the Home Office regarding the arrangement now made as regards the Broad Street dwellings?—No, I have had no communication with the solicitor of the London and North Western Railway Company.

1364. Are you aware that that letter states—I am only reading what the Home Secretary said in the House of Commons—that if the company used the dwellings for the purposes of their station, or otherwise than for model dwellings, they would seek powers under a private Bill and thus come under the housing obligation. You are not aware of that?—I noticed that in the Home Secretary's answer to the question addressed to him; but they are not bound to do that.

1365. In other words, they have given a pledge to him. If they have given that, that is sufficient for that case, but it is not sufficient, is it, for other cases?—No. If this case had not been noticed it would have got through without being objected to.

1366. With reference to the Broad Street Dwellings case and the London County Council, so far as you are aware had they intimated to the Shoreditch Borough Council that they were taking action with regard to that?—No, we have not had any communication whatever with them.

1367. And neither has the Member of Parliament for Shoreditch had any representation upon the subject from the London County Council, has he?—No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Adjourned to Tuesday next at 12 o'clock.

Die Martis, 10° *Junii* 1902.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN.
Viscount GORDON (Earl of ABERDEEN).
Lord HATHERTON.
Lord WENLOCK.
Mr. JESSE COLLINGS.
Mr. CLAUDE HAY.
Dr. MACNAMARA.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN IN THE CHAIR.

THE HONOURABLE EDWARD LYULPH STANLEY called in; and Examined as follows:—

Chairman.

1368. YOU are Vice-Chairman of the London School Board, I believe?—I am.

1369. The School Board made application to this Committee to make a statement to the Committee with reference to the effect of these Standing Orders on the rehousing of the working classes who are removed under Acts of Parliament, and they said that you would be so good as to attend here and to state their views?—Yes.

1370. Would you kindly make a statement to us of their views in just whatever way you think best?—I ought to preface my remarks by saying that I cannot be taken exactly to state the views of the School Board for London, because the School Board for London collectively have never so consolidated their views as to enable any person to state them. The memorandum from which I shall give evidence was laid before, and approved by, the Works Committee, of which I am Chairman, and I shall endeavour as far as possible to state what I believe to be the general tendency of their opinion, but it must not be taken that I am stating officially the views of the School Board, because they will be rather the views that I, from considerable experience of the School Board, submit to you. I should like to say that, as this Committee knows, the old Standing Order, which is ineffective, was very much strengthened after the sitting of the Royal Commission upon the Housing of the Poor, and there have been subsequent increases of stringency in that Standing Order. We never experienced any very material trouble from the Standing Order until the Session of 1898-99. The School Board for London had always acted in conformity to the law for the time being, and where a site would have involved a large displacement of working class population the School Board limited their action to taking a moderate site, and then in a subsequent year (perhaps the next year or the year after, or it might be three years after), if necessary, they came for a further site to enlarge that first site. In 1898 not only did Parliament increase the stringency of the Order, but by *ex post facto* legislation they re-opened what the School Board had done legally in the previous years, and threw upon them a liability to rehouse where they had acquired property without the obligation to rehouse. Of course, from that time the School Board has been anxious more than ever—so far as it could consistently with its duty under the Act of Parliament to provide the school places in the neighbourhood where the children live—as far as possible to avoid taking property occupied by people belonging to the working class; but as the duty falls upon the School Board to provide the school places not merely reasonably near, but, having regard to crowded thoroughfares and other things, very near to the populations needing the schools, they are not free agents in the selection of sites; and we find it very difficult to acquire sites—and especially difficult to acquire sites, very costly as they always are, in the crowded parts of London, where we should be anxious for the welfare of the children to get good-sized playgrounds. We are pressed to acquire as little as possible when the very onerous obligation of rehousing is put upon us as well. I wish to submit that a body like the School Board, acting under a statutory duty and not acting for profit, when making a provision which in itself is very much for the advantage of the working classes, has a claim to be treated with equity by the Home Office in using their discretion as to enforcing the Standing Order. One first point I would make is that it is quite impossible to rehouse in congested parts of London in anything like the immediate neighbourhood where the people are displaced. I think our Bill (it is the usual form) talks of "the immediate neighbourhood." There is, of course, a discretion in the Home Office; but I think in the case of such a body as the School Board the presumption ought to be that the discretion will be used in favour of a great latitude as to rehousing. I need not point out that in the whole of a district like Bethnal Green, Tower Hamlets, Bermondsey, Southwark, and so forth, and, in fact, in all the inner ring of London

Chairman—continued.

Chairman—continued.

London, there is no vacant land to be got, and if you displace 150 people on one site you cannot rehouse them "within a mile" without displacing, probably, some 150 people on the other site; so it goes on continuously, and there is no remedy.

1371. So, therefore, you would be in favour of increasing the area within which the rehousing might take place?—I think that in a great town that is absolutely necessary, and I think, even in the case of people to whom I think you may be more strict than to public bodies—people who are promoting great clearances for their own profit—even there, though it is not my business to go into evidence about that, the rehousing cannot always take place in the immediate neighbourhood. I think common-sense would show that a railway company clearing away a place like the Midland Railway Company cleared away in Somers Town cannot possibly rehouse in the neighbourhood; they must either by workmen's trains or suburban accommodation meet the exigency. But I am not concerned to go into their case; I want to draw a distinction or a difference between a body who are under a Parliamentary obligation to provide a school in the immediate neighbourhood, and who have no choice, and a body who for their own profit have come to Parliament for powers. I wish to say further that we are in very serious difficulty in this matter. Personally, from my long experience on the Board, I say it is far more advantageous to the ratepayers of London and to the children who are to be educated, and to all concerned, that, if possible, the site for a school should be acquired in a rather better neighbourhood, with better houses than a slum neighbourhood; the better houses are always more open at the back; they generally front to fresher streets. If they are near a slum it is a good thing for the children to go a hundred yards or so out of the neighbourhood of their slum into the fresher air; and also, from the point of view of this Committee and the Standing Order, there is no displacement of the working class, whose interests ought to be considered. We are exposed to very great difficulty; and I think if we could get a little support from public authority it would be a help to us. If the presumption were to be—other things being equal—in favour of taking property where no obligation to rehouse would arise, that would help us to some extent. I may say we have that very serious difficulty in relation to this. The people who can make themselves heard, when it is a question of selecting a site, are the well-to-do; they are the people who can write to the "Times" and make agitation; and when it is a question of selecting a site, we find ourselves very apt to have the site with the fresher air, the big backs, and open gardens behind struck out of the schedule, and to be thrown back upon a site which displaces the working class. I may say we have had that trouble for three years running in Hampstead, in a case which some members of the Committee will have seen spoken of in the newspaper. I should like to press upon the Committee also, from the point of view of the School Board, that it is far more important, I think, for the welfare of the working people in a congested district that a few of them should be removed, and that those who remain should get the benefit of fresh air and recreation ground and open space near their homes, than that the area of the playground of the schools should be stinted and cramped in order to keep a rather larger population living under unfavourable and congested conditions with what air they may have there. I should like to show to the Committee a plan which illustrates this. We built a school at Daniel Street, Bethnal Green. It has one of the most liberal playgrounds that we have provided in the whole of that crowded district. We ventured to acquire it, though at great cost, because at the time we acquired it we were not subject to the obligation to rehouse.

Chairman—continued.

1372. Was it covered with buildings?—Yes. I will hand in a plan which shows the houses as they stood, and by the red line showing what is now playground. There was thrown upon us there retrospectively an obligation to rehouse the people whom we removed, and I have no hesitation in saying that if that obligation had existed at the time we acquired the land we should have acquired a much smaller site, and yet I say that it was more for the advantage of these poor people of Bethnal Green that some hundred or so of them should remove to the suburbs, and that the remainder should have this element of fresh air, rather than that all should remain in Bethnal Green and none of them have fresh air. I may say, in handing in this plan, you will not assume that the land shown as vacant land upon it is vacant. This plan was made at the time the great Boundary Street improvement of the County Council was in hand, while the land was cleared; it is now all covered with houses. The red line indicates the whole of the ground we cleared, which is now a spacious playground, greatly to the advantage of the people. This plan, of course, shows the houses that were there before. I do not know anything more important for the children in the crowded parts of London than adequate playgrounds. We have been fortunate enough in one or two very rare instances in the heart of London to get vacant land, where we have provided schools with large playgrounds; but those cases are very exceptional; and anyone visiting the schools in the poor parts of London—especially those built in the earlier days—would see how very small the playgrounds are, and what an immense boon it would be to the people in those districts if they could have larger playgrounds. I will hand in another plan showing in Southwark two very good large sites which we acquired, fortunately, the one in consequence of Lord Llangattock (who was the ground landlord) carrying out a great improvement, and the other land we acquired in connection with land acquired by the Guinness' Trustees. We were very fortunate there; but these cases are quite exceptional. I wish to hand in the plan that people may see what

Chairman—continued.

what a boon it is in these parts of London to get playgrounds of that sort; but, as I say, they are very rare.

1373. We realise that?—This is the site bought of Lord Llangattock, and this is the site bought of the Guinness' Trustees (*pointing to the plan*). I only want to press that upon the Committee. We must all be anxious to consider what is for the welfare of the labouring classes in our great towns; we must consider that we have a right to set-off what would be a great boon to them, but would very likely not be granted if the obligation of rehousing were enforced too strictly.

1374. Then, just that I may be able to follow you, when you say it should not be enforced too strictly:—There is a discretion, of course, at the present time in the Home Office as to the number of people for whom they are to require houses to be re-erected; do you mean that they should be directed in some way by Parliament, in the case of the London School Board, not to require a number of the people to be rehoused equal to the number which is displaced?—I think that in working an Act of this sort, or a Standing Order of this sort, you must give a very wide discretion to the Department of the Government which is entrusted with the carrying of it out; but my impression is that for the moment the set of the tide is so entirely in the direction of housing the working classes that people get an exaggerated idea of the importance of that one point of rehousing, and do not look at the question all round. Of course, I do not ask for exceptional legislation for the School Board for London. I take School Boards, because School Boards in all big towns are under obligation to provide schools; but I think that if the Home Office could have regard to the balance of advantage it would be desirable that they should do so. If it were possible, for instance, for the School Board, in submitting a site to be selected, to say: Now if the obligation to rehouse is not strictly enforced we shall be able to give a larger playground; it is the duty of the public authority to consider whether it is more to the advantage of the people in these crowded places that the public body should secure a site which will enable the children to get a good large playground than that the public body—whose duty it is to provide the school—should give a smaller playground, because it would shrink from the obligation of rehousing; I think that is a matter which the Government Department—whether the Home Office, the Local Government Board, or whatever body is entrusted with the duty of doing it—might fairly consider. I quite feel that ultimately it must be a Government Department which must finally decide the equities and the balance of advantage. I only submit that that is a point that ought to be borne in mind. And another point that I wish to have borne in mind is that I think it might be recommended that the public body which had to make the Provisional Order or confirm the action of the public authority, whether it be the Board of Education in the case of schools, or the Local Government Board

Chairman—continued.

perhaps in the case of some urban improvement in some municipality, should have it as an instruction that they ought rather to favour that scheme of improvement which would displace people who could easily find their own homes, and who were not tied by their labour—the occupiers of more middle class property—and not, as they do far too much, give way to influential opposition and force upon the poor the body that is taking the site. I am quite certain of this, that it would be far cheaper to the ratepayers, quite apart from the question of rehousing. Our experience has been that if you buy better property just outside the area of the poor, you get more land for your money, you get airy land, and you get better land than you do if you go into a slum. I can give an illustration of that. The School Board for London built four schools in the neighbourhood of Lisson Grove, which, as some members know, is in a very poor, slummy part of Marylebone; three schools were built in the earlier days of the School Board on very small sites (sites of something like 10,000 feet each) in very crowded, unwholesome streets. We paid not only a great deal more per foot for those sites, but more altogether than we paid for a site which we bought on the edge of Lisson Grove, fronting to a street called Grove Road. There we got fresh air; we got straight into the street; we got every advantage. Of course we had to fight a very strong residential opposition there—that is what we always have to fight; but I think one would be glad if there could be some intimation of opinion from an authoritative body to the effect that the confirming authority should rather have regard to the advantage of getting the airier and better site at a more reasonable price, and not have so much regard to the residential opposition of people, who, after all, may suffer but little annoyance or but little inconvenience; they have the whole of London to choose from; they can buy a good class of house and go wherever they want to go. I think that would be an important thing.

1375. A suggestion of that sort—tending in that direction at all events—has been made to us by the Home Office. They have suggested that the area of rehousing should be enlarged in the very sense you have just mentioned?—That is a slightly different point. I quite agree as to the area of rehousing; but I was on the point of acquiring a property in the immediate district. I say where you have mixed property—rather better class property and rather slum property, or purely working class property—it is desirable that the local authority, if they think fit, should be encouraged to acquire the better class property rather than the working class property, quite independent of any obligation to rehouse; I say it is cheaper to the ratepayers, who have to carry out the improvement, and it is better for the people who would use the improvement. I may say there has been another kind of pressure put upon us which we want to be protected against in London.

1376. Pressure

Chairman—continued.

1376. Pressure put upon you by whom?—I was going to say, by what used to be the vestries, but are now the borough councils. The London School Board rate is a municipal rate over the whole of London, and we are very apt to find pressure put upon us by the local authority, which operates against our acquiring in a particular area a better site, because they want us to do at the expense of London as a whole what otherwise would be a municipal charge upon the district of the borough council—the clearing of a place which they call a slum, but which probably is only a working class district. Therefore we have to fight not only the residential opposition of the people occupying the better houses, but we have to fight the opposition of the local sub-municipal authority who want to get their street improvements done under another name at the expense of London as a whole; and I think we have a fair claim to be a little protected in that respect, and to be not only allowed, but encouraged, to get property which would be both cheapest for London as a whole and be the best for the particular part of the people of London who have to use the thing when done. I may say that another point (if I might venture to express an opinion upon the general policy) is this: I think everybody must agree who has followed this question (and I may say I have followed this question for a great many years—ever since the great West End improvements, the Shaftesbury Avenue and Charing Cross Road, by the Metropolitan Board of Works), that the great hardship arises when a large clearance is made rapidly of a large population. Slow and gradual displacements of population are going on automatically, as a result of certain economic laws, which apply not only to London, but to every great town in England and on the Continent—a centrifugal force of the population, because the heart of great cities becomes extremely valuable for commercial purposes; and while that operation is going on slowly and gradually, every year the population adjusts itself to it; and therefore I think to take what I may call a sort of cumulative dose of rehousing—five or six houses this year, five or six next year, or a few years after—and then to total them up into a whole and charge the local authority with rehousing on that basis, is to apply a costly remedy to a thing which is not really a serious grievance; because I say a small and almost infinitesimal action going on year by year adjusts itself to the social conditions of the time, and the real grievance is a sudden displacement. And, further, I wish to say that in London, unless the Home Office uses a liberal discretion, the areas within which houses may not be taken without rehousing are very large. When the Standing Order that was moved by Lord Salisbury after the Housing of the Poor Commission was passed the areas in London were parishes; in some cases those were very large; but you have now made the areas the local municipal boroughs, which are in many cases very much larger. I will take as an instance Wandsworth. The municipal borough of Wandsworth stretches from Putney to beyond Streatham. If, for instance, the School Board is building a school in Putney and building a school in Streatham, and takes ten houses at each place (the distance from the one to the other is about four miles), nobody can suppose that that is cumulative in operating as a pressure upon the working class. If you consider that to disturb ten houses is not sufficient to make it worth while to interfere, the mere fact that the thing happens to be within the same legal area, but about four miles off, does not at all make it reasonable to cumulate those two groups. And I think there, too, the Home Office ought to have power to say—where the sites are very remote from each other and do not affect the same population—that they will not enforce the Standing Order. I say that in all these cases I should be quite willing that it should be left in the Home Office, after hearing reasons submitted, to deal equitably with the whole question.

1377. Do the Home Office now, as a matter of fact, if you take a small number of houses in one part of London and a small number in another (say two miles off or three miles off), add those together and consider it as one removal?—I think they are bound by law to do it. The Standing Order, or the Provisional Order, says that if you take twenty houses within one municipal area they shall be so treated; therefore I will take the illustration of Lambeth (I do not want to weary you with too many illustrations). You might be taking some houses near Waterloo Bridge (which is a crowded district) and some houses near the Crystal Palace (which is not at all a crowded district), and if the two aggregate twenty I think the Home Office would be bound to say: Now you are subject to the rehousing obligation for twenty houses. I think that ought to be looked to; the real neighbourhood of the area should be considered. I think this question originated from the fact that people wanted to guard against railways which had a long scheme.

1378. Of course, the railways are a different case altogether?—Yes.

1379. They are doing it for profit?—Yes.

1380. And, of course, all their scheme is sure to affect one district, and one district only, in all probability—I mean in their Bill?—There is another point I should like to press upon the Committee. There again I think the Home Office have the discretion, but I am rather anxious that the Committee should indicate the direction in which they think in some cases the discretion might reasonably be used. Of course, when we build a school it is built because it is urgently needed; the children are without a school, and the obligation to rehouse ought not necessarily to be antecedent to the right to take the houses. I have already pointed out that you cannot rehouse in the immediate neighbourhood; and I think the Home Office have admitted that all you can do is to treat the housing obligation in a great town on a certain sort of clearing house basis—that is to say, to pay in so much housing accommodation to meet the housing accommodation that you take out. Nobody supposes that when a great

***Chairman*—continued.**

great clearance is effected—even if you rehouse upon the same site—you rehouse the people that have been displaced; you do not even rehouse the same type of person. I might point this out: Take the site I have shown you on *that* plan—the great Boundary Street improvement of the County Council in Bethnal Green—it was a very large displacement. I should think 10,000 or 15,000 people at least were displaced; and the County Council have made a very fine improvement, with nice streets; but we had two schools on that site, and we know quite well the type of children there; and we know that since that clearance and rehousing have been effected an entirely different class of person has come in; the other people have been dispersed. They were, if I may say so, rather a low type, and they have gone into other places which either were slums before they went to them, or which have had a tendency to turn into slums by their going there. The site has been covered by nice new houses in nice new streets, and you get a better and more thrifty class of people rushing in to occupy those houses. You never do rehouse the same people as those you displace. I think when you have a public body—whether a School Board or a municipality, or anything like that—appointed to do a particular public work, you may very reasonably allow them at once to get forward with their public duty, whether it be the making of a new street, the building of a school, the building of a fire brigade station, or anything that is absolutely necessary for the municipal life of the town. While that difficulty of the Home Office Order exists, as to providing other accommodation, or seeing that other accommodation is provided elsewhere—I think it will occasion very serious delay if from the time of promoting your Bill—when you get your power—you then have to take steps to satisfy the Home Office and get another site. It would infinitely delay the satisfaction of the public needs of the community if the public authority, whose Parliamentary duty it is to meet those needs, was delayed in performing its duty.

1381. Then you would allow them to begin pulling down before they rehoused?—Yes. Of course, the Home Office have power to do that; and what I would wish is that in cases of this sort public bodies—who are bound to act under public Departments and by Act of Parliament, and by previous sanction of loans and plans and all that at every step—should be allowed to get forward by anticipation; that they should be treated liberally in the matter of the promptitude with which they should perform the various parts of what has become their public duty. I agree that it has become their public duty to rehouse; it is also their public duty to provide for other objects, whether it be a school or a hospital, or any other object. Railways companies have their capital to employ in buying sites, and business habits to guide them; they do not have to ask anybody else about this; they can buy land by private agreement; they can look forward; they can anticipate; but I think that a body which has at each step to walk in the fetters and chains of administrative super-

Chairman—continued.

vision ought to be encouraged to go a little quicker in the various stages of their work.

1382. Have you in practice found that the Home Office has been strict upon you in enforcing that obligation, that you must rebuild before you begin to pull down?—We have only had, of course, one case. We have always been very careful to avoid liabilities under the Standing Order; and it is only when Parliament, by *ex post facto* legislation, put upon us the legal obligation which was not a legal obligation that we performed the acts that we have been forced to perform; we have taken very good care not to schedule so as to bring us within the obligation. And I may say that we have been subject to very great delay. I think the Act was passed in 1898; we are now in 1902, and though we have tried to press on negotiations with the Home Office, and have taken every trouble to try and find a public body that would build for us, we have finally agreed with the London County Council; we liquidated our liability by paying to the London County Council £10 a head on every person we displaced. It amounted in the aggregate to about 1,030 people; therefore we have paid about 11,000*l.*, and the County Council have taken the burden off our shoulders; and we have only now, in the last couple of months, got the final permission of the Home Office to go forward and to build the school—or, rather, to rebuild. I can give an instance relating to this: We had a very old, insanitary, bad school, which we had determined to pull down and rebuild. In connection with that there were a few houses occupied by the working class; and we have been kept waiting for about four years unable to touch that school or to do anything; hiring, too, all that time another school, into which we put some of the children temporarily. We were put to great expense, and it is only just now, within the last month, that the negotiations have been completed. We are now going forward. I think that shows very great delay in the negotiations. I do not want to blame the Home Office; I only mention as a fact that very great delay has arisen in performing our work.

1383. The Home Office have given their consent to the transfer of your obligation to the County Council?—Yes.

1384. And they have accepted the County Council to fulfil the duty which otherwise would have fallen upon you?—Yes; and I have no doubt that in the case of any other obligation put upon us of a similar kind we should be very glad of anybody in that way. We have quite enough to do to look after our own work in educating the children; we do not want to be a housing authority in any way; we would rather by far pass that on to some other body. May I put another point as to the question of rehousing? I think it is only fair that anybody who is called upon to rehouse should only be called upon to rehouse as many persons as in accordance with the sanitary bye-laws of the district would properly have been housed in the old houses. I do not think it is fair that a local sanitary authority

Chairman—continued.

should connive at insanitary overcrowding in an old district, and then, when some other body takes the houses—in which, as a matter of fact, where there ought to be seventy people there were 140 people living—say, in those houses you shall rehouse the 140 people. I think the obligation to rehouse ought to be, co-extensive, not with the population living in the accommodation removed, but with the population that ought to be living there. I think it is clearly an unjust thing that people who take a few decrepid, bad houses, which have so many cubic feet, should be called upon to build a lot of fine new houses with twice as many cubic feet, simply because some other authority has permitted those houses to be overcrowded. That, I think, is only common justice, that the basis of rehousing should be the accommodation, and not the people who accidentally were inside the houses. There are other points involved in this subject. I think I have mentioned some of the principal points which have been in the mind (and experience) of the School Board in working this rehousing question. I hope it will be understood that I do not at all come here to give evidence against a reasonable obligation to rehouse working people who are displaced by improvements; but I think that in enforcing that obligation regard should be had to what I may call the equivalent advantages, which in some cases are afforded, of great playgrounds and then balance the convenience; and secondly, that public authorities in discharging a Parliamentary duty should be treated somewhat differently in the equities by the Home Office from persons who come for the purposes of profit to make great clearances.

1385. That really is the completion of your statement, is it?—I think so.

1386. Just one question with regard to this retrospective clause which was passed in the Session of 1898-99; could you put it in? I do not think I have it?—I have got all the Provisional Orders year by year. *Here* are all the Provisional Orders. (*Handing in the same.*)

1387. Sub-Section 12 of Section 4 of the Education Department Provisonal Order Confirmation (London) Act, 1899, says: "Any house . . . . which may have been occupied by persons of the labouring class within five years before the passing of this Act which have been acquired by or on behalf of the School Board, and for which houses no substitutes have been or are directed to be provided by any scheme approved by the said Secretary of State under the powers of any previous Act relating to the School Board shall for the purposes of this section be deemed to have been acquired under the powers of this Act and to have been occupied on the fifteenth day of December last by the same number of persons belonging to the labouring class as were occupying the said houses at the date of their acquisition." Would you just tell me what proceedings took place under that? Do you remember? I presume the houses which had been taken during the last five years were added together and that the School Board was (presumably) required to furnish new houses to that

Chairman—continued.

extent. Is that so?—Yes. I may say that, of course, as we had acquired these houses with no obligation attached to them we had of course taken no census, at the time, of the population; but we furnished the best imfornation we could, and the Home Office used their own judgment, and between us we came to an agreement as to what was the probable number of people spread over these five years. If I rightly recollect I think the total number that we were acquiring, or had acquired, amounted to something like 1,400 or 1,500, but as the difficulty was very great we abandoned certain property over which we had powers in order to diminish the number; and ultimately, as I have told you, the number was cut down to 1,030, because, as I say, in order to escape from this obligation we abandoned certain property over which we had powers, but where we had not yet turned out the people, in order to diminish our liability.

1388. And that liability has now been transferred to the London County Council?—That has been satisfied by payment of a liquidated sum to the London County Council.

Dr. *Macnamara.*

1389. The School Board has not, I gather, formulated any specific views on this question of the general policy of the obligation to rehouse?—No. I have said that at the time when that retrospective Bill was passed the School Board made very active efforts to escape from it—to resist it—and *this* memorandum, which is substantially the evidence I have given, was laid before and approved by the Works Committee, which is the Committee charged with this work and who represent the Board; but as I said at the opening of my evidence the School Board has never formulated in any memorandum approved by the Board such minute detail as I have given.

1390. On this question of rehousing?—On this question of rehousing.

1391. You have been among the members of the Board, and the views you have been putting before the members of this Committee are, generally speaking, the views entertained by members of the Board or a majority of them?—That is my belief.

1392. I gather from you that the Board has taken very great care not to bring itself under the obligation to rehouse in past years?—Yes.

1393. That is your point. Why did the Board take that care?—I think there are two reasons: one, of course, is the reason of expense (it is a very serious liability to rehouse); another is the reason of delay. Where we have this obligation to rehouse our action is very much complicated—we cannot get on. A third reason is one (I have mentioned the expense) quite apart from rehousing, the fact (and I am quite satisfied that it is so) that those of us who have had to do with acquiring sites are convinced that not only are sites occupied by comparatively middle class property far healthier and better for the children, but

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

but far cheaper to buy. I can remind Dr. Macnamara, of course, of the celebrated Hampstead case with which he is familiar; I have no doubt he is familiar with the case of The Grove, Camberwell, and many other cases; he knows how we have struggled to get proper sites—sites a little more airy and fresh and open—and have always been met by residential opposition.

1394. Would it be fair to say that the Board, in taking that great care not to bring itself under obligation to rehouse, has always specifically avoided taking twenty houses of the working classes in a particular scheme?—Yes.

1395. Was that a temporary policy of the Board at any particular time, or was it the general policy from the very beginning?—The question of rehousing only became operative to the Board after what I call Lord Salisbury's Standing Order, which came in the Session of 1884, I think, when the Housing of the Poor Commission reported. In the earlier days of the Board—when first I became a member of the Board—the Board rather did take poor property in slums, because, I think, they were more sensitive to residential opposition. Ever since I took an active part on the Board—long before the Standing Order of 1884—I pressed upon my colleagues the policy of taking better property for the two reasons I have given—first, that I thought it was actually cheaper; secondly, that it was far more sanitary and better and airier for the children we had to educate; and so far as my influence has gone we have striven continuously to get out of the slums and rather to build our schools near the children, but in better streets.

1396. It would be grossly unjust to the Board, would it not, to suggest that this policy of what I may call evasion was the result of any partisan complexion of the Board at any time?—I say, certainly it would be unjust. I should not like to use the word "evasion."

1397. I wanted to use a softer word myself, but I think the word has been used?—I should not like to say, when there are certain statutory obligations, that if you take steps to perform some other duty without bringing yourself within the reach of those obligations you are evading anything.

1398. At any rate the course which has been adopted has not been dictated by the result of any complexion of the Board at any particular moment, from the point of view of party?—No, certainly not.

1399. With regard to the Provisional Order of 1898–99, did I understand from you that the Board took exception to the course which Parliament pursued in regard to imposing cumulative obligations?—Yes, we instructed our Counsel to fight it with all the energy we could.

1400. Why did the Board take that course?—For two or three obvious reasons. It was putting us to great expense, putting us to great inconvenience, and it was doing a thing which is generally considered quite contrary to all the principles of English law—passing an *ex post facto* law. Of course, it was unjust, impolitic, and onerous.

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

1401. Would it be your view that the obligations, such as they now are, to rehouse are laid upon the Board quite legitimately and reasonably?—Well, it is not for me to judge of the reasonableness of what Parliament does; but what I say is this, that any obligation we know of beforehand we can meet and deal with. What I object to is, when in a given year we have complied with all the legal obligations of that year, that in some subsequent year some law should be passed reopening that which we did legally in a previous year, and convert it into an illegal act.

1402. That is the whole proposition. Apart from this particular case, do you think it desirable that the School Board should be compelled to rehouse at all, through the County Council or any other agency, when they demolish artisan dwellings?—I should certainly think it was unnecessary, therefore unreasonable. If we took a number of houses (suppose we wanted to put up a cookery school, and took a couple of houses in one place, and, for some other purpose, took a couple of houses in another place, taking houses all over London, from one end to the other) and pooled them, for anyone to say: You shall rehouse in respect of all those houses would seem to me to be very unreasonable, because it does not meet any social inconvenience or suffering. As I have said before, I think these small, minute displacements are inappreciable. It is only large displacements of the population which disturb the social economy of the working classes.

1403. Do you think that is the view of the general body of the members of the Board?—I do not know. I have given more attention to this subject than most members of the Board. I have been very familiar with it for a long time, but I should be very sorry to say what might be the view of people who possibly have not thought about it.

1404. When you started out you told us that there had been no formulated view upon this, but that you thought you were in a position to express the general view of the Board?—Yes, in so far as the matter has affected the working of the Board. The Board has not been obliged to formulate its opinion on the obligation put upon it; and whether the Board has any general theory on the subject of reducing the limits of municipal rehousing I should be very sorry to say.

1405. Can you tell us whether the Board, generally speaking, quite freely accepted the new obligation of the Provisional Order of 1898–99, that is to say, as to the cumulative obligation to rehouse?—They had no choice; it was put upon them.

1406. I know; but I want to ask you whether it would be true to say that the members of the Board generally cordially accept the new responsibility placed upon them?—I should be very sorry to speak for others. All I can say for myself is that I had no choice but to accept it, because it was the law, but I should accept with great reluctance and great resentment any similar

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

legislation in any future year which should reopen any of our past transactions which were legal at the time they were performed.

1407. May I ask you whether you have read the evidence which was given by Dr. Robinson, the Town Clerk of Shoreditch, at the last meeting of the Committee?—I have not read any of the evidence.

1408. Then may I just read a little to you?—Yes.

1409. I asked Dr. Robinson: "With regard to the London School Board, it is Gopsall Street, I think, the school that you referred to?—(*A.*) Yes. (*Q.*) In all, I think, the Board has demolished places to the extent of 350 persons in ten years? (*A.*) In the case of that one school. (*Q.*) Is there any other in Shoreditch? (*A.*) No; I am not aware that they have built any others. (*Q.*) Do I understand you to say that we have demolished 350 artisans' dwelling places? (*A.*) No, 350 persons; there would be about twenty-five houses, or something like that." Elsewhere he says there were 350 persons displaced in that case, and neither the School Board nor anyone else has rehoused them. If the School Board have demolished, as Dr. Robinson says, twenty-five dwellings, they would be under the obligation to rehouse, is not that the fact?—Not necessarily.

1410. Can you tell me whether Gopsall Street was taken in two sections?—I cannot tell you. I have not looked up the facts of Gopsall Street, I could furnish them to the Committee. The Clerk informs me that in the case of Gopsall Street, the people we displaced there have been included in the 1,030 we are rehousing through the London County Council.

1411. Then Dr. Robinson is mistaken when he says that the School Board did not rehouse at all in connection with the Gopsall Street demolition?—I would rather not deal with Dr. Robinson. All I can say is, from documents furnished to me by the Clerk, that I find that at Gopsall Street we took twenty-four houses, which were occupied by 229 persons, and that those 229 persons have been included in the 1,030 for whom we have paid 10*l.* a head to the London County Council to rehouse.

1412. Then what I have read you as being Dr. Robinson's evidence is not quite accurate as a fact?—So far as it differs from what I have said, I say it is incorrect.

1413. Would you say that the lack of proper housing accommodation in London has had a very serious detrimental effect upon the work of education?—I should think that every social drawback has a very serious detrimental effect upon the work of education. I should also say that the want of fresh air as I have already said, would be more important to the people living in a very poor neighbourhood, and that the children should have a proper playground, than that they should all be kept upon the spot.

1414. I am dealing with the question of housing accommodation?—You may take it from me that I agree that everything which tends to lowering the stamina, self-respect, and the position of a person, acts injuriously upon his character, his social position, and everything else, including education.

1415. Did I gather from you that you thought, as I understood you to put it, that the tide of public opinion in favour of rehousing was recently setting too strong?—I think I said that people were losing sight of the proportions of things, and other advantages which might be set against it.

1416. Now, with regard to rehousing and the question of playgrounds, do I understand that the Board would take larger sites, and thereby secure a considerable space for playground were it not for this rehousing obligation?—All I can say is that that is the policy which I should advocate; I, as Chairman of the Works Committee, and having a good deal of influence in determining, should say to my Committee: Now, if we can get this land without the very onerous obligation of rehousing I should be in favour of getting a much larger playground for this school; if we are to be tied down strictly to the rehousing obligation, then let us keep it down to the minimum.

1417. You cannot say whether the Board would take that view or not?—No; I believe I should carry my Committee with me, but it is conjectural, of course.

1418. I gather that the 1,030, which is cumulative obligation, has been handed over for a consideration, which is agreeable to the Home Office, to be dealt with by the London County Council?—Yes.

1419. You do, as I understand, generally support the policy of continuing to have the obligation liquidated by the County Council; do you think that a desirable course to pursue in the future?—I do not say necessarily the County Council. My idea is that we at the School Board have quite enough work to do without either undertaking to build houses or to be landlords and collect rents for houses. I should prefer to leave to others that work, which is alien from our proper functions, and I should be quite open to have it done through the Guinness Trust, through the Peabody Trust, or the Waterlow Company, or any other body who would satisfy the requirements of the Home Office; I should do it at a minimum cost to the School Board. As a matter of fact, we tried other people, but we finally got to agreement with the London County Council, and I am perfectly willing to go on upon those lines. I have no municipal theory in the matter. If the County Council said, We will take your burden upon ourselves for 10*l.* a head, and the Guinness or Peabody Trustees said, We will take it at 9*l.*, I should close with Guinness or Peabody.

1420. You talked of the experience the Board had met with in going to a particular locality in order to get a site for a school. You said, I think, that pressure was put upon the Board to induce them to take a site which was an insanitary site, and one which would have to be cleared away by the Borough Council, and therefore be a charge upon the local Borough Council rate, and that for that

Dr. *Macnamara*—continued.

that reason the Borough Council desired the School Board to acquire that site, demolish the houses upon it, clear that area, and build their Board School there, the obligation then falling upon the county rate?—Yes, that has been my experience.

1421. Will you give us examples of that?—I will give you an example which you will remember yourself. The Stepney Town Council came to us and proposed that we should take a site instead of the site that we did finally acquire, because they said, "You are taking good rateable property, and we would rather you took this, which is a bad area." I daresay you remember the pressure that was put upon us to clear that site.

1422. From an educational point of view it was desirable that you should not clear that site; it was known to the Board previously as an inferior site for educational purposes?—Yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1423. You, in the course of your evidence, said you thought some exaggerated importance was attached to the question of housing, and that the advantage of playgrounds ought to be set against any evils which might flow from the provision of playgrounds, so far as housing is concerned. Now, how could playgrounds be in your judgment a "boon" (to use your own word) in crowded parts, if they made the homes of the children even more intolerable than they had been by intensifying the crowding?—I do not admit that the provision of a playground in a crowded part of London intensifies any evil by increasing overcrowding. If we were to clear a space of 10,000 feet in Bethnal Green or in Bermondsey, or in any other populous place, and throw it into a playground, what would happen would be that possibly the seventy or eighty persons who had lived in the houses that had been pulled down would drift elsewhere; but, of course, if the municipal authorities did their duty they would not allow in any case overcrowding in any individual house. There is a minimum space that is laid down for health, and it is the duty of the municipal authority not to permit overcrowding. What would follow, in my judgment, would be, not overcrowding, but displacement.

1424. What would happen, in your judgment, if it were absolutely necessary that the people should reside, for reasons of their work, in that immediate neighbourhood, as in the case, say, of Rotherhithe?—Of course, there are great advantages, I know, in people living near their work. I am afraid you could not find any place in London where people could all reside—even in cases where it is very desirable that they should—near their work. That, of course, is the case all over London; and, of course, as you know, in the building trade the workmen go very great distances to their work; they work some times at one place, sometimes at another, and I do not think that a displacement of forty or fifty peopel (because it is not a large displacement—the question of a larger playground or a smaller one) would be found to operate effectively in the genera working out and settling down of the social conditions of London.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1425. Is it not in your experience the fact that in the case of Rotherhithe the work of many of the men depends upon the tide, and that owing to the necessity of the people residing close to their work, even in a small space, involving, say, about a hundred people, they were actually driven into the streets, and had to reside in the streets for a fortnight before they could get other accommodation?—I do not know that; it may be so. I mean, if you tell me it is so I accept it.

1426. You somewhat resented the use by Dr. Macnamara of the word "evasions" by the School Board. Do you allege or do you state that the School Board did not evade their obligations?—Certainly.

1427. How did it come to pass that very strong action was taken by the Home Office in casting upon you that retrospective obligation?—It was not taken by the Home Office; it was taken by Parliament.

1428. The Home Secretary is responsible to Parliament for the administration of these laws, and if he had thought that the School Board had behaved correctly he would have said so, would not he?—I am not the keeper of the Home Secretary's conscience. I know that Parliament passed that law, and we had to submit to it.

Chairman.

1429. But it was not the law at the time you did the act?—No.

1430. It was an *ex post facto* law?—Yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1431. I beg your pardon. I understand the position was this, that the School Board stated that they had no legal obligation to rehouse, and the Home Office took a different view?—No, that is not so.

1432. Pardon me. Let me finish my question. In any case, it has been considered desirable that the doubt should be set at rest by the introduction of this very stringent retrospective clause. The Home Office never brought the attention of the School Board to the fact that in their mind (the mind of the Home Office) the School Board should have rehoused, did they?—No. What happened was this: There was agitation got up in Parliament; questions were asked, and Parliament then put into our Provisional Order a clause which imposed upon us for five years back a duty which had not previously existed. That was an Act of Parliament.

1433. You mentioned that the Borough Councils endeavoured to get their municipal improvements done by the School Board at the expense of London?—Yes.

1434. Could you give any instance of that?—I could give you four or five if I went to the office and looked them up; I have not come prepared with chapter and verse, but I know that we have repeatedly had pressure from Borough Councils to take a low-class property instead of the property we

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

we had scheduled; it has been urged by them that we were taking property which yielded profit to the rates, and that they would rather we took property which was a burden to the rates.

1435. The local authority has to consider the rateable value of its district, has it not?—I do not think it was surprising that the local authority should make that application.

1436. And it is the Public Health Authority, is it not, in the district?—Yes, it is a great many authorities; it is the paving authority too.

1437. Allow me to follow that point up for a moment. You said you thought the present arrangement for rehousing was unsatisfactory in so far that the School Board was called upon to rehouse, not the number of persons which, according to law, should reside inthose houses, but the number which had resided there, whether that number exceeded the number allowed by law or not?—I said I thought the obligation to be imposed by Parliament should be the obligation to rehouse, not the people who in fact were found in a given set of buildings, but the people who, under the sanitary bye-laws, could properly be accommodated in those buildings.

1438. Would it not obviously follow from that that if the law were as you would desire it, you would increase the overcrowding in that particular district?—I think it is the duty of the sanitary authority to prevent overcrowding.

1439. Yes; but it is known that if the sanitary authority enforced the sanitary law the result would be that that enforcement would turn thousands of people into the streets in London. Do you wish the School Board to be the agency through which to make that danger even more acute than it is at present?—I do not think so; and I do not follow your remark.

1440. I am very anxious you should understand it; perhaps I do not put it quite clearly. In your judgment the School Board should only be called upon to rehouse the number of people who, under the Public Health Act, ought to reside in the buildings?—Yes.

1441. In many cases that number is exceeded, is it not?—It may be so.

1442. I understand it is?—I understand that it probably is; I am not answerable for that.

1443. It follows, does it not, that if you only rehouse the number which, under the Public Health Act, is permitted to reside in a house, whereas that house had been hitherto inhabited by a larger number, you would intensify the evils of overcrowding by scheduling that particular property?—I should not put it so myself, and I cannot agree with it as you put it. I should say the "person" who has intensified the evil has been the local authority, who are chargeable with health matters, and who have permitted the houses to be overcrowded.

1444. Suppose they turned the people into the streets, so as to keep themselves within the four corners of the Public Health Act, would not they absolutely increase the evils of overcrowding in other directions?—They might or might not. In preventing overcrowding they would be doing their duty. It is not part of our duty to regulate the accommodation for housing the people.

1445. Is it the practice of the School Board, when they submit a scheme to the Secretary of State, to send a copy of that scheme simultaneously to the local authority?—I think not.

1446. You think not?—I am not aware that it has been our practice; I do not think it is our duty.

1447. Then you make no intimation to the local authority of what your proceedings are in respect to dishousing and rehousing?—Oh, yes, we do, because we have to advertise in a local newspaper, in November, when we propose to acquire any houses preliminary to getting a Provisional Order; we have to advertise both in general newspapers and local newspapers our intention; therefore, in that way it is brought to the mind of all people, local authorities and others.

1448. How is it, then, that in the case of Gopsall Street the Borough Council knew nothing about the action you had taken to rehouse?—It is impossible for me to say.

1449. Or as to the exact number of persons to be displaced?—It is impossible for me to answer why the authorities of Shoreditch are ignorant of what goes on. I cannot say anything as to that.

1450. That is not an answer to my question?—I say we advertise in the local papers.

1451. Can you tell me the local papers you advertised in in that particular case of Gopsall Street?—I can send for them. We advertise in the Bethnal Green papers as well as in the "Standard," the "Times," and other newspapers.

1452. In your remarks as to the local authorities you rather suggested that they wanted their improvement done at your expense?—That has been my impressions from communications received from them.

1453. You cannot suggest that in the case of the authority concerned in Gopsall Street, can you?—I have not suggested anything whatever as to the authority concerned in Gopsall Street; they were not in my mind at all at the time. Of course, if I were to look up the history of the Bethnal Green property, and the authorities concerned in it, I might find something, but I am not prepared to say now.

1454. You never made any communication to the borough council concerned in this Gopsall Street school, though there you displaced 239 persons according to your own statement?—We never make communication to any municipal authority; we obey the law; we advertise in the local papers and leave the people locally concerned to take advantage of that notice.

1455. In this case of Gopsall Street, the rehousing only took place some years afterwards, when this retrospective clause became operative?—That is so.

1456. So that practically for some years the housing accommodation in that district was reduced; and it was only when Parliament put that

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

that obligation upon you that you paid a certain sum to the County Council to provide other housing accommodation?—That is so.

1457. Then may I take it that you express the view of the School Board generally in this matter?—I have already said to what extent I express their view. Of course my answers are my answers only. Speaking from my experience, I have told you how far I think I am expressing the general views of the School Board; and you may take it that substantially the evidence I have given was laid before the Works Committee and approved by them.

1458. Have you found in your experience, speaking on behalf of the School Board, that the Home Office has been prompt in handling this question of re-housing?—The Bill imposing these duties upon us was passed in 1898, and we have now in 1902, just completed our arrangements. But I have not come here to make an accusation against the Home Office. They might possibly say that we have been dilatory. It might be a matter of recrimination.

1459. It struck me from what you previously said, that it was an accusation against the Home Office that you were making?—No, I meant to point out that (necessarily, I think) when you have to have negotiations between public bodies, and to get agreement to schemes, a great deal of delay necessarily follows, and I think that people who have had to do with legislation depending upon Government Departments have found that there has been a great deal of delay.

1460. Has the Home Office ever asked the School Board to be more prompt in its treatment of the question?—Not that I am aware of. There has been a very long correspondence with the Home Office. This is the whole correspondence (*exhibiting the same*). I will look through that if you like but it would be tedious to the Committee if I were to take you through it.

1461. I only want an answer to my question?—I could not answer with regard to a particular expression in a long correspondence.

1462. The School Board has never by communication to the Home Office, or by any communication to anybody, suggested that the Home Office has been dilatory?—I am now speaking purely from memory. My impression is that we have been very anxious to get on and have been repeatedly pressing this matter forward.

1463. Pressing the Home Office?—That is my impression. I could not, speaking from memory, myself say that the Home Office had been unreasonably dilatory. A great many difficulties had to be adjusted and the negotiations were therefore very protracted.

1464. In your evidence in chief you distinctly conveyed the impression to my mind that the Home Office had taken an undue time in dealing with this housing question so far as the School Board is concerned?—If that is the impression that I have conveyed, I should like to correct it, and say that the impression I wish to convey is that as a matter of fact there has been four years delay before this question could be settled; I say therefore that these obligations do involve a very great deal of delay.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1465. In other words you do not accuse the Home Office?—No, I do not. I call attention to the fact of the delay.

1466. On the contrary, you think they act very promptly?—No, I will not give to the Home Office any certificate of good character either; I am only giving the fact.

1467. You favour the arrangement whereby you comply with your obligations in regard to housing and rehousing by a cash payment to a central authority?—To some other body; not necessarily the central authority. I am in favour of our getting rid of this work and delegating it to any people who will do it to the satisfaction of the Home Office.

1468. Do you think your work would be expedited by making an arrangement, or the having an obligation put upon you, to furnish the local authority concerned (the Borough Council) with a copy of your scheme, when you send that scheme to the Home Office?—No, I see no advantage in it.

1469. No advantage?—No advantage.

Lord *Hatherton.*

1470. In your evidence in chief, as I understood you, you said there were a hundred or so of persons in the houses which occupied the site now forming the playground for the Daniel Street Schools?—I do not know that I mentioned the exact number. I daresay there might be a hundred or so.

1471. Are you able to tell the Committee whether this "hundred or so" removed into the suburbs, or did they increase the overcrowding in the district?—We have absolutely no means of tracing the people who are displaced.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

1472. You said in your evidence that there was an exaggerated importance attached to the point we are now considering; you meant by that the point of rehousing under private Acts, under private Bills, did you not?—I think I said that people's attention was concentrated purely on the question of rehousing, and that they did not sufficiently regard the whole of the circumstances connected with the improvement.

1473. You are aware, are you not, that the Amendment of the Standing Order is the one and only point we have under consideration in this Committee, not the general rehousing of the working classes?—I understand you have to consider that question.

1474. You spoke of the residential opposition. Do you mean by that opposition to the erection of the Board Schools, or to the erection of houses for the working classes who have been displaced? Do the residential population, as you term them, oppose a Board School being erected in their neighbourhood?—Yes.

1475. And they also oppose the erection of houses to accommodate the working classes?—I never said that; I dealt exclusively with their opposition

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

opposition to the erection of the Board School. I said we were hampered in our selection of sites because when we wanted to buy a site upon which to build a Board School, which site would avoid the displacing of the working class, we were met with a very strong residential opposition on the part of the middle class.

1476. That is a point I want to clear up. I suppose the opposition arises from the fear that the value of the property would go down in that neighbourhood?—It is alleged to be that.

1477. You said something about a larger area; the present area is the municipality?—Yes.

1478. Do you advocate an extension of that area?—No. On the contrary, I called the attention of the Committee to the fact that some of these municipalities are so very large that unless the Home Office took a reasonable view (I illustrated it from Wandsworth, and I took from Putney to Streatham) you might have two displacements four miles apart which might be pooled together so as to call upon the people causing the displacements to rehouse.

1479. At any rate, your evidence seems to me to be in favour of leaving more discretion to the Home Office in dealing with the local authorities and school authorities?—Yes, I should be in favour of giving a wide discretion to the Home Office.

1480. Referring to this great delay of four years, I suppose communications were going on all that time between the Home Office and the School Board?—I have here the bundle of correspondence (*exhibiting the same*). You see how bulky it is.

1481. Then you spoke of a requirement to provide for an overcrowded population; in other words, if the houses pulled down contained 150 people, we will say, instead of the hundred only which, from a sanitary point of view, ought to be there, you thought it was unfair to require them to build for the 150?—Yes.

1482. Do you know that the Home Office have ever made such a requirement?—The only case we have had with the Home Office is this one *ex post facto* case where the Home Office and we agreed upon the numbers; but the Standing Order refers to the nu..ber of people in the houses, and not to the number of people the the houses will accommodate; and I think the Standing Order should deal with the number of people that the houses will properly accommodate.

1483. Then, would you take it from me that the Home Office takes into consideration the overcrowding, and that they would not require the excessive number to be provided for, but only the number that ought by right to be there.?—I am very glad to hear that, but I think it would be more satisfactory if it were put into the legal instrument under which they act.

1484. Exactly. That comes under the head of leaving a larger discretion to the Home Office?—No, excuse me; it comes under the head of limiting their discretion.

1485. In that direction?—The Standing Order says: You shall rehouse the people who are displaced—which I say in some cases may be unreasonable. I submit that the Standing Order should say: You shall rehouse the number of persons which the demolished property would have accommodated.

1486. And I understood you to say that in the public interest, as far as the municipal authorities go (in which I include the School Board), you would abolish that requirement?—I should leave that in the discretion of the Home Office.

1487. What is your opinion about reducing the limit of the twenty houses?—I may say that the alteration in the Standing Order—the alteration of last year, I think, or the year before—has already reduced the limit very largely. I do not know whether Parliament has quite realised it, but the definition of a "house" now is, "any separate tenement"; and in the poor parts of London many of these quite cottage houses have three families in them, and therefore each house, as a man would judge them in the street, counts as three houses; therefore, by the operation of the Standing Order you very largely increase the number of what a casual man in the street would call a "house."

1488. You went on to say in one of your answers that where you pulled down a couple of houses here and a couple of houses there, that should not be taken into account?—I think it should not.

1489. In other words, that they should not be "pooled"; I think that was your expression?—Yes.

1490. If you pulled down houses in that way, might not they in the aggregate amount to the same number of people displaced as would be the case if it were done all in one block?—They might.

1491. I want to know the difference as regards rehousing?—The difference is that twenty houses scattered over an area of two or three square miles is very different from twenty houses in one street.

1492. I gathered also that the School Board transfers its obligations for a money consideration to the County Council. Has the School Board ever rehoused itself or built houses itself?—No.

1493. Never?—I may say (it is a very small point), in connection with the school I mentioned as unsanitary premises, and which we are rebuilding, that part of our agreement with the Home Office was that some houses which were dilapidated, and which were going to be pulled down to throw into the playground, should be kept standing; and we are going to put them in repair and let them to tenants. To that minute extent we shall be landlords, but it is practically nothing.

1494. There is only one question more. You spoke of playgrounds. I gather from your statement that you thought it more in the interests of the working and poorer classes, as regards their health and social condition, to have large playgrounds than even to provide fresh accommodation?—I put it in this way: I took the illustration of Daniel Street, Bethnal Green. I suppose within three-quarters of a mile of that school there is a population of considerably over a hundred

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

dred thousand; it is all a densely crowded district. I say it is more to the advantage of people round that school—to which there are about 1,200 children going at present—that their children should have a playground of three-quarters of an acre, and that instead of there being a hundred thousand people there and no playground, there should be 99,900, and a good playground.

1495. Then I take it that if the School Board felt inclined to provide a large playground, but were prevented doing so by the expense of the obligation of rehousing, you would, in the public interest, wish the Home Office to have power to dispense with the obligation in that respect?—Yes, I think so.

1496. You think it is more for the public good that it should be done?—The same thing would apply to a municipal authority who wanted to make a public recreation ground. I can quite understand that in a crowded part of London the Borough Council might be wavering as to whether they would make a recreation ground, and if they were told: You must rehouse a couple of hundred people if you do that, they would not make it. I say it would be better in a densely populated district that a couple of hundred people should be removed, and that the remainder should have the recreation ground in that congested area, than that the 200 more people should go on living in the district.

Lord *Wenlock.*

1497. Would you explain, please, to me who is the tribunal you go before when you bring forward your schemes?—You mean for acquiring sites?

1498. Yes?—First of all the Education Department, and then Parliament.

1499. You talked of residential opposition upsetting some of your best-laid schemes?—Yes.

1500. Who is the tribunal that decides that, is it a Parliamentary Committee?—It begins with the Board of Education; it then passes on to Parliament. The proceedings are these: When we find a new school necessary we look about for a site, and we communicate with the Board of Education. In any case, we have in November to advertise for three successive weeks in a certain number of general papers in London, and also in local papers circulating in each district where we propose to acquire a site, giving the numbers of the houses on the site we are proposing to acquire. Then that goes before the Board of Education, who tell their inspector to hold a local inquiry very often; and then people come to that inquiry and object if they wish to object. Then the Board of Education makes up its mind somewhere about January or early in February to draw up the Provisional Order. Then that Provisional Order passes out of our hands into the hands of the Board of Education—we, of course, paying counsel and any legal expenses connected with the Order—and they have the control of it. That Provisional Order goes before a Private Bill Committee of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, and, finally, if it comes out, it comes out as law.

Lord *Wenlock*—continued.

1501. I thought it did. I only asked the question because you suggested that this Committee should in some way enable the tribunal to come to a different conclusion as regards these particular sites. I do not follow how we could influence the opinion of any Parliamentary Committee, and insist upon your getting what you call a better class house for your site where you would have no obligation to rehouse?—Our trouble has not come so much from the Parliamentary Committee as from the Board of Education; they have been much more sensitive to residential opposition than Parliament would be. I should have much more confidence in Parliament in the matter of having regard to the interests of working people as opposed to the opposition of the residential people, than in the Board of Education.

1502. I did not understand how you thought we could assist you in this particular matter, or what words we could insert in our Report that would help you?—I think if you were to say: It is desirable, as far as possible, that Government Departments, in permitting the acquisition of land by a public or municipal authority should allow the acquisition of such land as will not involve the displacement of people of the working class. That would be an instruction to the Government Department that would guide them in selecting which site they should put before Parliament.

1503. That is to say, that we should recommend, in spite of the opposition of residential owners, the placing in their midst of a board school?—Yes.

1504. Regardless of their wishes?—Yes; that you should lean to the poorer people rather than to the middle classes.

1505. I suppose you would admit that the proximity of a board school to a residential neighbourhood would seriously injure the remaining property?—I will admit that it has been often said that it would do so, but what I say is that our experience teaches us that after the school has been put up it has not injured the remaining property at all.

1506. Would not you yourself rather object to living immediately outside a board school?—I think if you were to put a board school in Grosvenor Square no doubt it would affect the property there. I think the residential opposition in that case would imperil any attempt to get a site such as that, but these are not the districts where we put up schools. It is rather as between the lower middle class and the very poor that this question arises. I could give you plenty of instances where the putting up of board schools has not injured the surrounding property. I know an instance at this minute where the building owner brought a claim against us, and got more than a thousand pounds damages for consequential injury to his property; but no sooner was the board school up than he at once put up houses of a better class than were there before, and charged higher rents than he had charged previously.

1507. Close to the school?—Close by the school.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

DR. WILLIAM JOB COLLINS, D.L., J.P., is called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1508. YOU are a member of the London County Council, and you have been Chairman of that Council, I believe?—That is so.

1509. But you are now the Chairman of the Housing of the Working Classes Committee?—Yes.

1510. What I want to ask you is, whether you can suggest any amendment or improvement of this Standing Order with regard to the removal of the working classes. I may say this, that we have heard of a variety of instances in which the Standing Order is alleged to have been evaded, and that this Committee has nothing to do with transactions which proceed on private agreement. Our inquiry is entirely limited to removals of the working classes which have taken place under Acts of Parliament?—I think I understand the nature of the inquiry this Committee has in hand, my Lord.

1511. Then, really, the point on which we want information is in what way do you think this Standing Order now existing requires amendment and improvement, and can you give us any specific amendment?—I propose to lay before the Committee, with your permission, instances which have come to the notice of the London County Council in which the Standing Order appear to have been evaded. Before doing so, might I call attention to the fact that the Housing of the Working Classes Committee of the County Council has attentively studied the Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes of 1885, and they notice in that Report in reference to the Standing Orders the Commission quote Sir Edward Watkin to the effect that he did "not consider that there is any injustice in saying to people who control a private enterprise, and who remove houses of the labouring classes in the construction of their works, that they shall, before they commence their works, erect an equivalent amount of accommodation." That influential Commission recorded their opinion that as far as possible this principle should be universally applied. They themselves made suggestions for altering the Standing Orders then in operation, which they stated the evidence was unanimous in showing had been evaded. They also mention that further amendments of the Standing Orders might be required from time to time, and that possibly they might be strengthened by legislation. Now, if it be the object of the Standing Orders to secure that in any case where, under compulsory powers given by Parliament, houses of the working class are demolished an equivalent amount of accommodation should be provided by the promoters, then the Standing Orders now in operation would appear to be still insufficient, or evaded. One of the first instances which came before the London County Council was in the year 1889, in connection with the South Eastern Railway Act of 1882.

1512. I think it would be more interesting to us to know what really are the improvements

Chairman—continued.

and the amendments which you suggest should be made, than to go through cases of evasion, or alleged evasion, which have taken place, and which, of course, we cannot recall or alter. What would be interesting to me, personally, at all events, would be to know what are the amendments which you would suggest?—Of course, since this Committee was appointed the matter has not been discussed by the London County Council, consequently, I am not authorised to make specific recommendations; therefore it is only by certain resolutions at which the Council has arrived—chiefly on specific evasions—that I am authorised to give evidence on behalf of the County Council as to amendments they would desire this Committee to consider. That is why I was proceeding in the way I was doing.

1513. It seems to me that it is unnecessary to go through these things. Of course, we are in possession at the present time of instances of evasion or alleged evasion, but all those that we have heard of hitherto were possibly under the Standing Order as it stood. Now we are dealing with the existing Standing Order; and the question is how the witnesses appearing before us propose to prevent such evasions for the future. That really is the point which is of immediate importance to us, it is how to amend the Standing Order?—Then, may I say, my Lord, in reply to that, that in the case of the South Eastern Railway Act of 1889, and also in the case of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company's action in connection with their Act of 1890, the County Council have found it desirable to suggest that the Standing Order should be so amended as to apply to the taking of sites of houses as well as to taking the houses themselves.

1514. That is it. Thank you. That is what I want?—In both those cases the County Council took action, and that action appears to have been successful, at any rate in some respects, in securing accommodation in those two cases; but they desire that the Standing Order may be so amended as to prevent such cases occurring again; and, indeed, they made a recommendation in 1889 which, if it had been carried into effect, might have prevented the subsequent cases, such as Broad Street Dwellings and others, which have been mentioned to the Committee. Then it might also be a suggestion for amendment that the cases where land occupied by houses providing dwellings for the working classes is acquired by agreement, as well as by Act, might be brought under the operation of the Standing Orders.

1515. We are not able to deal with cases in which land is taken by agreement. The Standing Order, I do not think, applies to such cases?—In the year 1897 the County Council received a report in reference to the case of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway at Bermondsey, in which, under the Act of 1890, they had powers to take some 309 houses in Bermondsey occupied by members of the working class; they

submitted

Chairman—continued.

submitted a scheme in respect of 168 of those houses only; but subsequently, after the period for the compulsory acquisition of the property had expired, and also after the period in which the scheme should have been completed had expired, they proceeded to demolish the remainder of those houses; and it appeared that the company were offering more than the commercial value to the owners of the houses, in order that the tenants might be evicted and the houses handed over with vacant possession. This was the subject of a report by the Statistical Officer Mr. Gomme. The matter was represented to the Home Office by the London County Council, and in May, 1902, as the result of that action—though we received no further communication from the Home Office—we believe that two additional blocks of buildings (Chichester and Arundel Buildings) have since been erected, with a view to accommodate the additional persons displaced, and who were accommodated in the original houses.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1516. Did I understand you to say that that was done in 1902?—No, that was the date of the report of the officer of the County Council, not of the communication.

Chairman.

1517. Then you propose to prevent such an evasion as that for the future?—I think if there could be some machinery established by which there was some communication between the London County Council and the Home Office in regard to any scheme submitted by the promoters, in order that we might have knowledge of the scheme, and of the nature of the accommodation which it is proposed to provide, the London County Council (or possibly also the Borough Councils) might be able to give useful information as to the accommodation in the locality, and the class of persons who occupy the dwellings which are to be demolished.

1518. Then, if the notice with regard to the removal of the working classes which is sent in to the Home Office (which is required to be sent in to the central authority) were at the same time sent in to the London County Council (if they are the local authority involved), that would meet your view?—I think that would be a distinct improvement. Then the London County Council, I think, would prefer that London should be dealt with as a whole, and that any houses (not necessarily to the number of twenty, but any houses occupied by members of the working classes) that were taken should be registered, with a view to cumulative action and other provision being made by way of fresh accommodation, provided by the promoters, or by some money payment (such as has taken place in the case of the School Board) to the London County Council.

1519. You would propose that whenever a railway or other company took any house at all in London they should put down the name of

Chairman—continued.

that house upon the register?—That is my view, and it seems to be in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1885—that wherever the working classes are displaced equivalent accommodation should be provided. The County Council, I think, would view with favour the abolition of the twenty-house limit.

1520. But, as I understand you, you would go so far as this, that if fifteen houses were taken in fifteen different parts of London you would register all those houses and require equivalent accommodation to be provided?—Having regard to the knowledge we have of what is called the "house famine" in London, and the great demand for housing accommodation for the working classes, we view with jealousy the destruction of even a single tenement.

1521. Then will you, please, continue your statement?—In connection with that question of twenty houses being taken, we had some communication with the Borough Council of Battersea concerning a case (in which the London and South Western Railway Company under their Bill of 1897 were concerned) in which doubt arose as to whether more than twenty houses were taken or not. The Borough Council of Battersea seemed to think that a larger number than twenty were being taken, though the Home Office were subsequently satisfied, I think, that nineteen was the number actually taken in that case. At any rate, that indicates the need of the local authorities having knowledge of the statements which are deposited by the promoters, in order that they may have an opportunity of checking the accuracy of those statements.

1522. Before the Bill becomes an Act?—Before the Bill becomes an Act; and in connection with that question of the statement, I might remind the Committee that the Report of the Royal Commission of 1885 stated that they often found such statements to be "grossly incorrect." I do not wish to use such strong language as the Royal Commission employed, but we have found—at any rate, in one instance—(in the case of the London and South Western Railway Company's Bill of 1898) that the company's statement showed a difference as compared with the figures which our valuer obtained; that is to say, the company's statement showed that there were 231 houses taken with 1,837 occupants, while the valuer's figures showed 292 houses taken with 2,338 occupants, or a difference of sixty-one houses and 501 occupants. That points to the recommendation I have already suggested, that an opportunity for checking the statement should be accorded to the London County Council.

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

1523. You are aware that the Home Office examines into that matter and ascertains the number and checks the return of the railway company, are you not?—Yes, I am aware of that, but I do not think the London County Council at present has any opportunity of making a representation in the matter; at any rate, cases have occurred which have not come to our know-

Mr. *Jesse Collings*—continued.

ledge at the time, and we have not had an opportunity of taking effective action.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1524. That applies just in the same way to the borough councils, does it not?—That applies no doubt to the borough councils also. In that particular Battersea case that I have just mentioned the Home Office communicated with them in this way: They said, "Should it come to the knowledge of the Council that any further houses inhabited by persons of the working class are taken by the company, the Secretary of State would be glad to be informed." So that it would appear from that that the Secretary of State sometimes desires to be set in motion by the local authorities, and I am only anxious that effective machinery should be established in order that that communication might take place. Then I need not elaborate the case of the School Board, I think, my Lord.

Chairman.

1525. No?—Of course, we have had that dealing with the School Board that has been referred to. I do not know whether you would desire to have put in evidence the arrangement we have made?

1526. I think that would be a good thing. With reference to the School Board will you tell us of the case which has been quoted here, which arouse under the Act of Parliament of 1898, in consequence of which you finally have made an arrangement with the School Board that you will do the rehousing which is obligatory upon them under that Act. Will you tell us what has occurred in relation to that?—The matter was the subject of report to the London County Council on the 11th March, 1902, and at that meeting this resolution was carried: "That the offer of the School Board for London to pay to the Council a sum of 10,359*l.*, subject to the Council taking over the Board's obligations under the Education Board Provisional Order (London) Act, 1899, for the rehousing of 1,030 persons of the working class, and subject to the Council indemnifying the Board against any future liability which may arise in respect of its obligations under the said Act as to rehousing the said number of persons be accepted." We thereby took over the obligations of the School Board to rehouse some 1,030 persons who had been displaced by the Board at various times during the previous five years in Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, Camberwell, Bermondsey, Mile End, and Ratcliff; and the consideration which actuated the County Council in deciding upon the sum fixed was that the School Board should pay to the Council a sum which should repay the capital value of the annual deficiency which might be expected to arise by the erection of the dwellings. These dwellings were to be erected on land owned by the Council at the north-end of the Blackwall Tunnel; the sum we agreed upon was 10,359*l.*, or about 10*l.* per person. We have accepted a contract for the erection

Chairman—continued.

of these buildings, and there has been no delay in carrying the arrangement out so far as the London County Council is concerned.

1527. That was done, I presume, with the approval of the Home Office?—That is so.

1528. Had you ever had any similar transaction to that previously? Have you ever undertaken to rehouse on account of any railway or other company which had incurred such an obligation?—I believe the London County Council has not, but I believe there has been an arrangement between one of the Borough Councils and a company, but not on behalf of the London County Council. It was a case of first instance.

1529. You cannot speak to that?—Of course that involves a principle which is capable of extension and possibly it might be the wish of this Committee to make some recommendation which would enable railway companies to pool their obligations (as it has been said), and by reason of a money payment exempt themselves from the obligation to rehouse. I may say that a resolution was passed by the London County Council upon that question, but it is still in the committee stage, and therefore I am not able to say whether the London County Council is definitely committed to the policy. On the 5th November, 1901, this resolution was passed by the London County Council: "That in the opinion of the Council it is desirable that in all cases when railway companies seek powers from Parliament necessitating schemes for rehousing persons displaced, the companies should, in lieu of being bound to undertake the work themselves, pay to the Council the equivalent in money of the cost of carrying out such schemes, the execution of the work being left to the Council, to be dealt with in such manner as they may think best, and that the Railway Commissioners should be constituted by Parliament capable of determining the amount to be paid in each case; and that it be referred to the Parliamentary Committee to consider and report in what manner the matter can be brought to the notice of His Majesty's Government." That matter has not yet been reported upon fully by the Committee and the resolution was passed without debate in the Council; therefore it can hardly be taken as having reached its final form.

1530. Do I understand that that resolution would impel the railway company to hand over the rehousing to the London County Council whether they wished to do the rehousing themselves or not?—The terms of the resolution might possibly be so construed; but personally I should feel that there ought to be an option both in the case of the London County Council, and also, no doubt, in regard to the railway companies.

1531. Then you would only propose to do that by arrangement?—That would be my own proposal, subject to further discussion by the County Council; I think it would probably be a proposal which they would agree to.

1532. The resolution, as I heard you read it, appeared to me to indicate compulsion?—The resolution was proposed by Sir John Dickson Poynder.

Chairman—continued.

Poynder. He is proposing to give evdience *before this Committee, and if he does so he will be able to answer that question for himself.*

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

1533. Might I ask if there is not already such a power in existence, subject to the approval of the Home Office? Does not that power already exist, to be exercised in the same manner as a similar power was exercised by the School Board?—Effect has been given to an option in that matter in certain Acts. I believe there is an example which may perhaps be to the point in the case of Section 39 of the London and South Western Railway Company's Act, 1899, which empowered the London and South Western on the one hand and any Borough Council within the Metropolis on the other, to enter into agreement with reference to providing accommodation for housing the persons displaced under any scheme approved by the Secretary of State.

Chairman.

1534. That of course is a different matter?—A perfectly different matter; but it shows at any rate that the "option" has been entertained and has found legislative completion in that particular case. Should it be desirable to substitute a money payment for the obligation to rehouse there are some points which no doubt would have to be considered—as regards the cost of the land where the displacement has taken place; as regards the cost of the land where it is proposed to rehouse and the difference between the value of the land for commercial purposes in the rehousing locality and its value for housing purposes.

1535. Yes, but those would be mere details of such an arrangement if that arrangement was found desirable?—Precisely.

1536. We need not enter into that. Then is there any further particular in which you think this Standing Order could be amended with advantage?—No; I think I have mentioned the chief points in which we think the Standing Order in that limited reference could be amended. Of course the County Council has knowledge of many clearances which are effected outside compulsory powers; I believe they have been alluded to by previous witnesses. If the Committee desire to have any figures, I can give them for what they are worth.

1537. But of course they do not come before us. Clearances that have been effected by private purchase or private agreement do not come under this Standing Order, because the Standing Order only applies to Bills?—The question has been often discussed by the London County Council as to whether the Standing Order could be amended in order to meet such cases.

1538. Yes, but I do not think we can discuss those cases here (——).

Mr. *Jesse Collings.*

1539. There has been evidence put in before us by a witness from the Home Office to the effect that the Home Office have regular officers to examine the premises proposed to be pulled down and to take note of the population there, and to examine into all particulars thoroughly; and the evidence of that witness is that the returns of the railway people with regard to population are generally found to be correct; that being so, do you advocate a still further examination by the London County Council?—Yes, I do.

1540. Then you have not confidence in the process already carried on by the Home Office, who have officers for that purpose?—May I ask: Do I understand that the examination to which you refer is an examination that is made after the Act is passed or prior to the Act being passed?

1541. Before the scheme is approved?—But I think my suggestion had reference to an earlier stage—that we might examine the statements which are put in by the promoters in regard to the members of the working class who are displaced, or proposed to be displaced, before the Bill became law.

1542. This examination takes place before the Bill becomes law. What I want to know from you is whether you consider a further examination into the correctness of the returns of a railway company to be necessary by the County Council?—I think, if I may reply to that, there are two different things: there is the question of the statement of the persons proposed to be displaced, which is deposited with the plans; we desire to have an opportunity of checking that statement. There is also the question of the scheme which is prepared and submitted by the promoters after the Act has become law. The County Council there, again, would desire to have an opportunity of being heard in reference to that scheme, because, as recently as the case of the London and North Western Railway Company's action at Mornington Buildings, we have reason to believe that a superior class of accommodation has been provided at a higher rental than that which the persons who have been displaced would be likely to be able to pay in order to avail themselves of that superior class of accommodation; so that we desire to have the opportunity of being heard at both those stages.

Lord *Hatherton.*

1543. If the railway company, or other body which was subject to the rehousing obligation, was prepared to make an agreement to pay a sum of money instead of doing the rehousing themselves, would not friction arise if that agreement were made with the London County Council and not with the Borough Council in whose area the displacement took place? Would you ignore the Borough Council?—We should be very sorry to ignore the Borough Council; in fact, the London County Council recently held a conference with the London Borough Councils, so that there should be no fear of our interfering with any rehousing schemes which they might have on hand, either in connection with displacement or otherwise; and while not wishing in any wise to interfere with the action of the Borough Councils the London County Council, as the central authority, should be in a position to make a bargain with the railway company.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1544. Do you think the question involved in rehousing under the Standing Orders can be dealt with by Standing Orders, or do you think it is necessary that there should be a public statute?—Personally, I incline to the view that it would be simpler and more effectual if it were dealt with under a public statute.

1545. Can you give us any particulars of the figures as to the number of displacements that have taken place under public Acts, or which should have been included in public Acts in the view of the County Council?—I am not sure that I quite understand the question. I can speak with regard to the clearances that the London County Council itself has effected and the number of persons it has rehoused.

1546. You know the figures showing displacement under private Acts by railway companies and others, do you not?—Only as regards proposals made in Bills; I do not think I could give you a complete figure for all the displacements which have taken place. For instance, our statistical officer reported in July, 1901, that the total displacements of persons of the labouring class by all schemes according to the deposited plans in the year 1900 were 12,618; in 1901, 7,523; that the total of those which came within the obligation to rehouse in 1900 was 11,868; and in 1901, 6,624; and the total that is not liable to be rehoused, owing to the twenty-house limit was, in 1900, 750, and in 1901, 899; so that under the 1900 schemes nearly 6 per cent., and under the 1901 schemes nearly 12 per cent. of the total displacements need not even be considered in connection with the provision of new accommodation.

1547. You have not got any figures to show those that should, in the opinion of the London County Council, have come under private Acts, but which were not put into the schedules of the private Acts?—There may be many of those that we have no knowledge of under present arrangements.

1548. Have you knowledge of any? Have you any figures on that point?—I could not give it you in figures at the moment; I might be able to obtain them and send them to the Committee.

1549. Has the County Council ever acted in common with the Home Office on the assumption that statutory companies cannot own lands without express sanction under an Act of Parliament? I do not know whether you are aware of the evidence given by the Home Office on that point?—I rather gathered that the Home Office was uncertain on that point.

1550. Have you found the arrangements made by the School Board satisfactory previous to the arrangement they came and made with you?—No. We thought it was unsatisfactory that the School Board should have gone on from year to year, taking less than twenty houses—accumulating a default during a series of years.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1551. Under the arrangement made between the London County Council and the School Board, has the London County Council done anything to provide housing accommodation for the persons displaced in Shoreditch—particularly in regard to that Gopsall Street site, which has been quoted to the Committee?—The scheme which is arranged for rehousing that population was to cover the whole of the displacements during the previous five years.

1552. The School Board displacements during the previous five years, you mean?—The whole of the School Board displacements during the previous five years; but I am not clear as to whether it included that School Board displacement to which you allude. I think Shoreditch is mentioned in the list we deal with; whether it is the particular case of Gopsall Street that is mentioned there or not I do not know.

1553. In other words, there has been no specific rehousing scheme adopted by the London County Council, elsewhere than in Poplar, to meet the displacements made by the School Board?—That is the one scheme sanctioned by the Home Office for meeting the obligations which the School Board had acquired, and which we have taken over from them.

1554. There were some special circumstances in the case of Thames Tunnel and around there with regard to housing and rehousing in connection with the London County Council under the Standing Order, was not there?—Yes, we had a rehousing obligation in connection with that.

1555. Did the Home Office concur in the opinion adopted by the London County Council in that case, or was there a difference of opinion?—I do not recollect any special point of difference of opinion at the moment.

1556. Did not Section 53 of the Act—in which there was the model clause—impose upon the County Council (I think, for the first time) the obligation of supplying to the local authority a copy of the scheme simultaneously to sending that scheme to the Home Office?—I am not aware of that personally, but I have no doubt it is so, if the Honourable Member says so.

1557. And you would favour that course being universally adopted?—We have always cultivated the most friendly relations with the Borough Councils in regard to housing schemes.

1558. You would wish that it should be an obligation that a promoter, seeking powers to take lands under a Bill, should furnish not only to the Home Office but also to the London County Council and the Borough Council, a copy simultaneously of that scheme?—Yes, I should see no objection to that.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JAMES SAMUEL BEALE is called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1559. You are the solicitor for the Midland Railway Company?—I am solicitor acting for the Midland Railway Company.

1560. And you appear, I believe, for the Railway Companies Association?—I appear for the Railway Companies Association, of which I have been one of the honorary solicitors for nearly thirty years.

1561. And you have been requested to come here to give evidence to us with reference to this Standing Order which is under our consideration?—I have, my Lord. I come as representing the Railway Companies Association.

1562. Have you any suggestions to make with regard to the amendment of the Standing Order?—From the railway companies' point of view—the first practical suggestion for the amendment of the Standing Order is that the obligation to rehouse should take effect prior to the demolition of the property or the displacement of the tenants, but not prior to the acquisition of the property other than the occupier's interest. The reason for that suggestion is that it is practically impossible to comply strictly with the Model Clause as it stands at present. We do have to disregard, at times, the letter of the clause unwillingly, but we cannot help ourselves.

1563. Why?—Because of the commercial necessities of carrying on business, my Lord. Take a case your Lordship knows very well. When a Bill for a new railway or a new work comes into Parliament we have, of course, a large number of petitioners seeking, not so much to stop the work at to protect their individual interest; the natural way—the business-like commercial way of meeting those objections is to offer to come under an undertaking as to the conditions of acquisition of the property. At that early stage, before the Bill even becomes law, to get rid of opposition we often are, not compelled by any *force majeure*, but compelled by proper business-like considerations to come to an arrangement with the owner. It does not affect the disturbance of the tenant, it does not affect the occupation of the property at all; but the owner of some interest requires to have his position settled, and in order to get rid of his opposition to the Bill we have to deal with it.

1564. Does that conflict with the letter of the Standing Order?—That does conflict with the letter of the Standing Order.

1565. How?—Because we then acquire an interest in the property before we have made a scheme for rehousing. We can avoid acquiring in the strict literal sense and we do.

1566. You will have entered into an agreement to acquire?—We enter into an agreement to acquire. Only this morning I had an application from people in a case where, when the works are carried out, a scheme will be necessary, saying: The owner is removing to another part of the country, and will be glad to sell the property at once.

Chairman—continued.

1567. Is that a case in which some of the working classes will be dishoused?—That is a case where part of the property has working-class dwellings upon it, and I believe (I did not examine carefully) the whole number of houses would be more than ten in the parish.

1568. Then that is a specific amendment that you would suggest?—There are other cases. May I mention, just to illustrate, another case?

1569. Take it in your own way?—We may serve notices to treat for gardens of houses, and the owner, or various owners, may give us in reply what are called "92nd Section Notices"—that is to say, notices under the section compelling us to take the whole of the houses. Thereby a legal contract is made by our notice and the owners' counter notice for the acquisition of the entire interest. We cannot obey the letter of the law strictly as it stands. It does not affect the mischief against which the Model Clause is directed—the demolishing or displacement of the working classes.

1570. Then what specific amendment would you propose to remedy that defect? Just refer us to the clause and the words. Is it the short clause or the long clause or both?—It is the long clause, my Lord. The short clause only restricts doing anything. The amendment is in the second line of the clause.

1571. Of the first sub-section?—Of the first sub-section. Instead of the words "purchase or acquire" I suggest that it should say "demolish or displace the occupiers of."

1572. Instead of "purchase or acquire," substitute——?—"Demolish," or any equivalent word—"pull down."

1573. Yes, quite so?—"Or displace the occupiers." It may want some more words.

1574. "Demolish houses." The word "demolish" will not do?—I have not come prepared to suggest drafting.

1575. It is my habit sometimes, when a person says anything to me in the way of making a suggestion, to say: Will you just tell me exactly how you propose to do it? It is not a bad way sometimes?—I quite agree, my Lord.

1576. And I have no doubt from my acquaintance with you that you very soon could do it. I see the substance of your suggestion. Then what is the next matter which you would like to call our attention to?—The next matter, my Lord, is a matter rather of administration than of the wording of the clause, and that is as regards the practice of the Home Office (which is not the practice of the Local Government Board)—to fix rents.

1577. That does not appear at the present time in the Standing Order nor in the Model Clause, but the Home Office assumes the right to exercise it?—That is so; but I think, if I may venture to say so, it is within the reference to this Committee.

1578. That I do not dispute. Then you would propose

Chairman—continued.

propose words which would, in effec tat all events, exclude that power. Substantially that would be your amendment?—I think, my Lord, I would not go beyond a recommendation of the Committee that that power should not be exercised —I do not think it arises upon the drafting.

1579. I think at the present time the London and North-Western is disputing that power in the Courts?—I believe they are, my Lord.

1580. Then we shall see the outcome of that—or we shall not see it?—It arises upon the power of the Home Office—the central authority—to fix conditions, and they fix that condition. In our Midland case—which has already been referred to before the Committee—it has worked as we think most unjustly, and not in the public interest. The view I want to submit to the Committee is that such an obligation as is imposed upon the railway company—by fixing the rents as regards occupiers who are not persons displaced—who are entire strangers to the displacement—was never contemplated by Parliament, and does work very considerable loss and injustice to the railway company for the benefit of occupiers who are entire strangers to the proceeding.

1581. When you say that it has worked contrary to the public interest what do you wish to convey to the Committee exactly?—That it is not to the public interest that a particular class or number of tenants of properties in the locality should be selected and given properties below the fair commercial value of them; that it is not to the public interest that competition of that character (which I should call an unfair competition) should be introduced between these new dwellings and the owners of similar dwellings in the localityand similar property in the locality; and, further, that the effect of that is to unduly diminish the rateable value of the property, and cannot be to the public interest although it may not be a very large item.

1582. The rateable value of the property does not necessarily depend, does it, upon the rent which is paid?—Certainly, my Lord.

1583. Rent is an indication, but it is no more than an indication in the eyes of the Assessment Committee, I believe?—On rent-paying property it is the absolute basis.

1584. Is rateable value absolutely fixed upon the rent paid; I mean just let us make it exactly clear?—Let me put it quite clearly, my Lord, it is the minimum; the rateable value may be a good deal higher.

1585. Quite so?—The rateable value is never less, but you cannot raise the rateable value upon property which is actually let at a weekly rent above that rent.

1586. Above the rent?—Above the rent.

1587. Can you not? I ask you as a solicitor; I will take it from you; I am quite unlearned upon the subject, but I know cases in which the rateable value of property is fixed very much higher than the rents?—Oh yes, my Lord, so do I; but those are let on lease; those are not let at weekly rentals which are assumed to be *rack-rentals.*

1588. That is the distinction?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

1589. Then I am to take it that property which is let at a weekly rent is never rated higher than the actual amount which is paid in rent?—I think you may take that as absolutely true, my Lord.

1590. Thank you. It must be certain, of course?—If a weekly rental property, the rent must of necessity be what we call the rack rental; the full rental value that can be obtained for the property, the rateable value must be based upon that.

1591. I understand the objection you are now putting to us is that of the local authority, which wishes, of course, to rate all property fairly *inter se*, and of course as highly for its own advantage as it fairly can. Then I understand the objection of the local authority is this, that owing to the fact that a dwelling which is worth, we will say, 5*s.* a week is let at 3*s.* 6*d.*, the local authority is compelled to rate that dwelling in the parish at 3*s.* 6*d.* although that rateable value is not fair as compared with the adjacent property—is that so? I understand that to be your case?—That is quite correct, my Lord, subject to this observation, that of course I do not represent any local authority. I am not speaking for local authorities for the moment.

1592. I know; but the objection you are putting is that of the local authority, and what I want to get at is an absolute fact. I am only asking you for the fact. I am not going any further. I merely want to get it out as a fact stated by you on your knowledge as a solicitor, that that is so?—That is so. In the Midland case if we were not tied by the rents fixed by the Home Office the rateable value of that property would be raised by £800 a year, or 700*l.* a year.

1593. Then what is the next amendment that you would suggest—in what particular—in the Standing Order?—I do not think that we have any other original suggestions to make. There are some details of administration under the Standing Order which the companies would like to see different, but I think they are only details of administration; and I am not personally competent to speak very much upon them.

1594. Then that really is all that you have to suggest of your own motion?—I think so, my Lord.

1595. Now one suggestion that has been made to us here is that it might be expedient to enlarge the area within which rehousing should take place. From the point of view of the railway companies I presume you would be in favour of that?—You mean rehousing further off than a mile?

1596. What I mean is this: At the present time a railway company is compelled, when it ncurs a rehousing obligation, to build the new houses as near as possible to the place where the demolition has taken place?—Yes.

1597. It has been proposed to us that that area might be enlarged to the public advantage. What do you say to that?—It is very desirable that the requirements of each particular district and locality should be met; that there should be sufficient

Chairman—continued.

sufficient elasticity in the power under which the companies are acting so that they should not be limited to half a mile or a mile or any other distance; but that the requirements of the various districts (which are very various of course) should be capable of being met under the supervision of a central authority.

1598. And what do you say to the suggestion that has been made to us, that this whole question of rehousing of the working classes under these circumstances should be dealt with by a public Act and no longer by Standing Order?—Well, I think it would be a very obvious improvement; it is what Parliament has done with every other kind of obligation which it has gradually insisted upon. Instead of inserting it in every private measure they insert it in a general Act and incorporate it in Private Bills; it is a consolidation Act. The obligation remaining whether the statute in which it is contained, is public or private, is a matter of convenience only. Of course it would have the advantage that every company promoting a Bill would know then exactly where it stood and what obligation it had to face as a condition of getting powers.

1599. It has been suggested to us also that when the notices which it is necessary to give under the Standing Order to the Home Office—the central authority—are given they should also be communicated to the local authority at the same time. Do you see any objection to that?—Not the least, my Lord. They are deposited now publicly, and county council or other local authority can see them by taking the trouble to do so. If they want to have them sent to them (to their own house), I can see no sort of objection to that.

1600. The railway would have no objection to send them a copy at the time of the original deposit of the Bill?—If it is simply to save the people the trouble of going to get copies.

1601. Quite so; but of course giving them notice is entirely a different thing from requiring their approval. I mean this: You can say you would have no objection to giving them the notice; that does not mean that you would consent to their approval being required?—Oh no, my Lord, certainly not. If I may say so, it would be very inconvenient to have two authorities, either of which could stop the action of the other.

Earl of *Aberdeen*.

1602. I think you remarked that the interest of the occupiers ought not to be taken; the ostensible object is, is it not, that the occupier's interest may be protected; do you find, as a matter of experience, that the occupiers expect something more, namely, that they should get a benefit from the improvement or undertaking?—What I said was that the power to acquire, which we have to exercise, does not extend to the occupier's interest. We have, of course, to acquire the occupier's interest in the case of the working classes we displace. Railway companies have to rehouse where they displace.

1603. Do you find, as a matter of experience,

Earl of *Aberdeen*—continued.

that the occupiers are content with what you would regard as reasonable compensation, or that they expect more because it is the railway companies that are taking in hand the work?—I do not think so. The only thing the weekly occupiers will not have is to have the arrangement made for them. That is my experience, an experience extending over a very long period. You cannot compel occupiers to go where you want them; they will choose for themselves and settle for themselves. Therefore that accounts for the fact, which is known to all the railway companies, that whatever housing accommodation is provided a very small proportion only of the displaced people will occupy it. The largest proportion we ever had was 40 per cent., or 44 per cent., and it is often not 10 per cent.

1604. Then you would not be surprised to hear, what has been stated to us in evidence, that in one case where provision was made for 200 people, only thirty took advantage of that accommodation?—That is quite according to our experience. We have had a large number of schemes. The St. Pancras one was the case where the largest proportion of the old tenants went to the new buildings, and that was not half of them; not half the substituted accommodation was taken by the displaced tenants.

1605. Then I understand from you that it is a difficulty on that it is a drawback, that the Home Office claim the power that they now exercise in this matter (a power that is not claimed by the Local Government Board) to fix rents?—It seems to me obviously unjust. If it is right that the displaced tenants should have the opportunity of going into what must be superior accommodation at fixed rents, it cannot be right that strangers should have the same opportunity. If it were accommodation exactly of a similar character to that which was demolished, there would be no object in fixing the rents, because the rents would be fixed by the ordinary laws of supply and demand, but the fixing of the rents assumes that the substituted accommodation is better than that which has been removed; and if it is right that the displaced tenant should have the option of that accommodation at a rent below the commercial rent, it seems to me it cannot be right that an entire stranger should be able to come and say: I will rent rooms from you, but I will only pay half-a-crown a room, because that is the rent fixed by the Home Office, although the commercial value of the rooms is 3s. 6d.

1606. In quoting that, I take it, you are quoting what is within your own experience?—Yes, it is so. The Midland Railway Company, having to give this almshouse accommodation to somebody, gives it to their own servants in preference to giving it to strangers.

1607. As a matter of general experience in regard to disturbance in the matter of housing, is it the case that a very large proportion of such disturbance is occasioned by the operations of firms not acting under Act of Parliament?—I do not quite follow your Lordship's question.

1608. Is it your experience that a very large

Earl of *Aberdeen*—continued.

amount of the disturbance in the matter of housing arises not from the operations of railways and other companies proceeding under Act of Parliament, but through firms other than those acting through statute?—Speaking as an individual, I may say this: It does not come to me as a railway solicitor, but it comes to me as an individual taking an interest in that class of work, undoubtedly it must be so. Railway disturbances take place at intervals of long years.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1609. I understand you represent the views of the railway companies as a whole?—I do.

1610. You said, I think, that the railway companies would have no objection to send a copy of the scheme to the local authorities—that they rather favour that course?—The scheme?

1611. A copy of the scheme as to displacing and rehousing?—I do not know why they should have any objection. The local authorities get it as a matter of course now, all through the country, everything under the Local Government Board—they get it now. The Local Government Board; hold a public inquiry; they produce the scheme, they insist upon full notice being given, and, practically, they insist upon being attended by the local authority.

1612. I gathered, if I did not make a mistak,e from what you said in reply to the Lord Chairman that the railway companies were in favour of giving, or rather were quite ready to give, a copy of the scheme to the local authority even as it is now?—I cannot see any possible objection to it.

1613. Then I will quote to you some evidence which was given in connection with the London Brighton and South Coast Company's Bill on the 27th February, 1901, before a Committee of the House of Commons, in which that company says, referring to a letter of that date, that as a matter of principle they cannot agree to a provision which would entitle the local authority to a copy of the scheme. I only wanted to put this to you with a view of showing that evidently some of the companies do object?—I take it the matter you refer to there would be exceptional legislation for the Brighton Company, something put into an Act of the Brighton Company, and I object to that too.

1614. The request was made in this case that I allude to, and refused as a matter of principle, and not because it was singled out as against other companies?—Inasmuch as the railway companies have to submit a scheme to the Home Office they cannot prevent the Home Office giving copies of it to whomsoever they will. Why should it not be given to the local authority if they desire to have it?

1615. I am glad you agree with me and that you do not agree with the London and Brighton Company. That is evidence given before a Committee of the House of Commons. Now, may I ask one or two questions in regard to the question of fixing rents? You stated in reply to the Lord Chairman that the Home Office having power to fix rents was in your judgment not in the public interest, is not that so?—Yes, and practically the same thing applies as regards the question of the accommodation not being taken up by the persons displaced.

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1616. I do not quite follow that?—If accommodation is provided for twenty persons displaced, I do not say that it is not right, if the Home Office desire it, that they should fix the terms on which those persons displaced should come in, but why they should fix the rent at which strangers should come in I cannot see; and I think that is contrary to public interest tor the reasons I have given.

1617. Do you state that 20 per cent. of the persons displaced by railway companies find accommodation in the re-housing provided under the railway companies' schemes?—Something between 10 per cent. and 40 per cent.; 20 per cent. would be rather above the average, I think.

1618. That is your experience?—That is my experience.

1619. On what is it based, actually?—Investigation of the numbers.

1620. You could not put in particulars of the full detail of that, could you?—I think I could in the case of London.

1621. Do you mean in all cases, or is this only a particular instance?—That London case that I referred to was a large case. The percentage of displaced persons going into the new buildings in that case was the highest percentage I ever knew of.

1622. But have you particulars of all the displacements in the London areas?—I have *here* particulars of five cases.

1623. What are the dates?—In one case, under an Act of 1890, near Sheffield, twenty-five houses were acquired, and five tenants went in. That is 20 per cent. In another case, under an Act of 1891, at Chapeltown, near Sheffield, fifteen houses were acquired and four tenants went in. At Leicester, under an Act of 1889, twenty-three houses were acquired, twenty houses were built under the requirement of the Local Government Board; no tenants went in. Then, near Barnsley, under an Act of 1897, twenty-five houses were acquired, twenty-two houses were built, two tenants went in. Under another Act of 1897, at New Mills (not very far from Manchester), there is another case.

1624. These are selected cases, are not they?—No, Sir, these are cases in order.

1625. Under private Acts?—Under Midland Railway Acts.

1626. One company?—One company. I think they would work out to about a fair average. Under another Act, at New Mills, twenty-five houses were taken, seven of these went in; and we have several other schemes which are not yet ready for occupation, so that they could afford no criterion.

1627. Those are merely Midland cases?—Those are Midland cases.

1628. In your evidence-in-chief you stated that one of your objections to the Home Office fixing the rent was that they were strangers to the question, that was the phrase you used, I think?—I said that the tenants who were not displaced were entire strangers.

1629. No,

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1629. No, you said the Home Office (I took the words down) were strangers to the question?—That applied to the tenants, not to theHome Office. Those that I said were entire strangers to the matter of displacement were the tenants who came in that were not displaced.

1630. I gathered that you said that of the Home Office?—I did not intend to say that, and I do not think I did say it.

1631. I will put it in another way: Your experience brings you in contact with the Home Office in this matter continually?—No, not "continually."

1632. Whenever these cases arise?—Whenever these cases arise.

1633. And do you find that the Home Office are at great pains to study all the local circumstances and also what is fair to the railway company. Do you find that is the case?—I have no reason to doubt it, but, as a matter of fact, we have not had any clearance in London for some years, and therefore I have not had any dealings with the Home Office under their present advice.

1634. I understood that you represented various railway companies—not merely one. Did you not state that in your evidence to-day?—On the general question?

1635. On the general question. Surely you must have had some experience of the Home Office action in this matter?—May I put in in this way: I have every reason to believe that the Home Office take every possible pains to do justice?

1636. To do justice?—Yes.

1637. You said in regard to the provision of these new houses by railway companies that you thought it was not fair that the companies should be called upon to provide better working-class accommodation than that which they had destroyed?—No, Sir, I did not say so; I do not agree with that at all.

1638. Wait a moment; I have not finished my sentence—at a rent which was the same as that charged for indifferent property. That is how you put it, practically, is it not?—I think that is quite reasonable as regards displaced tenants. My objection to it is as regards accommodation not taken up by displaced tenants, but by tenants outside those who come in, and thereby get (what I venture to call) almshouse tenements for their rent.

1639. In other words, in any dishousing and rehousing scheme you would like a certain proportion of the rents to fall into the ordinary category?—Any proportion of the accommodation not taken up by the displaced tenants—yes.

1640. Supposing none of the accommodation was taken up by the displaced tenants, what then?—Then I cannot see why the commercial rent should not be paid for those premises.

1641. Though you had displaced a certain number of working-class persons from their habitations who had been paying a lesser rent than that which you would be able to get in the market for your new building?—Certainly. Those displaced persons have gone and provided for themselves elsewhere as they thought suited their own interest best, and I do not think the railway companies ought to be called upon to receive less than the commercial rent from entire strangers to the transaction, who come in and are willing to occupy the premises.

1642. Supposing—as in the case perhaps in London—that the railway company, in its rehousing scheme finds that the actual tenants displaced do not come into the new houses, but that there is a great dearth of working-class accommodation in that district, do not you think the railway company ought to be subject to an obligation not to charge a higher rent than that which was charged for the houses which had been demolished?—I do not think so; I think they ought to be bound to charge, and receive, a fair commercial rent for the accommodation provided.

1643. But suppose—as mivht be the case—that your demolitions necessitated the removal of certain persons from the immediate district (as in the case of Peek, Frean's works, where some works were demolished and the operations carried on at them removed to another district) you would be diminishing the housing accommodation in the locality nevertheless, would you not?—We ought to make good, and we have no objection to making good.

1644. Then you ought not to charge the commercial rent, ought you?—I am not objecting on behalf of the companies to making good the accommodation under the direction of the Home Office. What I have objected to is the compulsory charging of a lower rent to strangers—in other words, that we should be bound to house strangers at a less rent than they can get housed at in equal accommodation in the same locality.

1645. This is my last question. You think that, although the railway company may reduce the total amount of working class housing accommodation in a locality, it should not have cast upon it the obligation to let at a rent fixed by the Home Office that accommodation which it provides in substitution for the accommodation it has removed. Is that so?—As regards the rent fixed by the Home Office, I say they ought not to be bound to do that, except possibly as regards the displaced tenants. I say the rule of the Local Government Board is, in the view of the railway companies, a much fairer rule.

Earl of *Aberdeen.*

1646. With reference to the last question put to you, would you not say that if the object of the regulation at present in force is to give an opportunity to the people who have been displaced to have a habitation, there is no object in keeping the rent lower than the commercial value if those people are not going to use it?—That is so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Adjourned to Monday next at Twelve o'clock.

Die Lunæ, 16° *Junii* 1902.

PRESENT:

Earl of CAMPERDOWN.
Earl CARRINGTON.
Viscount GORDON (Earl of *Aberdeen*)
Viscount HAMPDEN.
Lord HATHERTON.
Mr. BOND.
Mr. CLAUDE HAY.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN IN THE CHAIR.

MR. SAMUEL CHISHOLM (Lord Provost of Glasgow) is called in; and Examined as follows:

Chairman.

1647. You appear, my Lord Provost, I believe, to give evidence to this Committee on behalf of the Corporation of Glasgow?—The Corporation have appointed me to do so.

1648. I think you know that the point which is before us is whether the Standing Orders, which relate to the supplying of houses for the working classes, who have been removed under the operation of Bills given to railway companies and others, require any alteration or amendment?—I am aware that that is the purpose of the reference. I am not here to speak in the interest of railway companies, or any other commercial undertaking. The sole point that the Corporation desire me to bring before the Committee is the operation of the model clause under the Standing Order, when applied to housing proposals of the Corporation itself. As at present the model clauses are imposed upon a Corporation that proposes to purchase and demolish houses with a view of rebuilding on the same area better houses than are demolished; and the point that I wish to bring before the Committee is the inadvisability of enforcing those model clauses in a case such as that, which is so entirely different from the operations of railway companies or other commercial undertakings.

1649. Then do you mean that you think that the Standing Order ought not to apply in those cases, or that it ought to be varied?—It is really our opinion that the clause should not be made to apply where a Corporation is promoting a measure for the purpose of rehousing the working classes themselves. For example, if we are to have houses built, and ready for occupation, before we purchase or demolish houses, which we propose to purchase and demolish, because they are unsatisfactory, it is obvious that we are simply blocked; we are unable to do that which we

Chairman—continued.

propose; and, assuming the case—a case which has occurred, and may occur again, and will occur again, doubtless, in Glasgow and elsewhere—assuming that we purpose purchasing a given number of houses, with a view of demolishing them and rebuilding them in more sanitary and satisfactory conditions, we are told by this model clause you cannot do that.

1650. You cannot purchase?—Yes, we cannot purchase until we have, first of all, houses prepared and ready for occupation for the displaced tenants.

1651. And that is physically impossible?—It is impossible. We do not wish exemption for the Corporation in all its enterprises; we have gas enterprises and electrical enterprises, and we are quite willing to submit to the most stringent clauses when we are promoting any purely commercial undertaking; but when we are proceeding for the very purpose of improving the condition of the poor, we realise that the imposition of this model clause simply obstructs our proposals.

1652. I suppose you are speaking of a case in which you propose to substitute houses for the existing houses; you would propose to substitute houses built in another place, not on the same site?—The proposal that I have in view is one in which we do propose to re-erect on the same site.

1653. Then, of course, it is physically impossible for you not to commence your bargain before you have pulled down the houses?—Precisely. If your Lordship is satisfied on that point, there are other reasons, which apply to other cases, where we may not wish to rebuild on the same site, but where we may wish to rebuild on some contiguous sites, and where we could possibly provide the new houses before the old were displaced, in which we would like a relaxation of the Order; for this reason: That when

we

Chairman—continued.

we require to prepare a scheme and submit it for approval before we purchase existing sites and existing houses, then the fact that we are looking forward to purchasing those existing sites becomes known, and the present proprietors enter into leases, which add enormously to the price that we have to pay for the property when we come to purchase it; all these things, as we are anxious to save the rates and make the scheme self-supporting, only add to the rents which we require to charge to the labouring people whom we wish to house. And, therefore, we think that a Corporation, such as Glasgow, whose only object is to do the best it can for its people, and who are proceeding with a proposal for the purpose of improving their conditions, should be left very largely to do what is wisest and best in the circumstances themselves without the imposition of such clauses as will, in the case I have referred to, obstruct them altogether, or, in the other case, with which I was dealing just now, will add so largely to the cost they have to pay as will necessarily raise the rentals of the future inhabitants.

1654. Have you considered the precise amendment which you would propose to the Standing Order, so as to effect your object?—I have not phrased it, but the suggestion simply is that in regard to proposals and purchases of the Corporation, with a view of housing the working classes, the model clauses should not be made to apply.

1655. Then what restrictions, if any, would you apply?—These restrictions would be provided for in the Bill or Provisional Order, which we would require before we came forward.

1656. But you must have considered probably what those restrictions would be which you would substitute for those of the model clauses. As I understand, at the present time, one or other of the model clauses is incorporated in your Improvement Act, is it not so?—That is so; but I do not suppose I am violating any secret when I say that we obtained a dispensation from the Secretary for Scotland, and did not require to work under the model clause, so far as the point I am referring to is concerned.

1657. I think the Bill, or, rather, the model clause, orders you to submit a scheme to the Secretary of State for Scotland?—It does.

1658. And when you say that the Secretary for Scotland grants you a dispensation, what do you mean exactly?—I mean that we did not submit the scheme at all.

1659. The Secretary for Scotland merely made no remarks?—No; we went to the Secretary for Scotland, and told him distinctly what our purposes were, and he was so satisfied that he said, "In that case there is no necessity for your having a scheme."

1660. But did you not have to prove to the Secretary for Scotland that there was sufficient housing accommodation elsewhere?—Yes, within a given area.

1661. That is a different thing. Then he did inquire, and he merely absolved you on the ground that without your building new houses there was sufficient house accommodation to be obtained in the neighbourhood which would be suitable for the purpose?—Yes, that is so.

Chairman—continued.

Viscount *Hampden.*

1662. That is to say, a temporary displacement would not cause the people any very great inconvenience?—I am satisfied it would not. Necessarily we, knowing the circumstances, and being interested in our people, would proceed with such a measure with caution, and so gradually that the inconvenience would be reduced to a minimum.

Chairman.

1663. Then it would rather appear from what you say that in Glasgow, under these improvement schemes, for which you obtained Acts, there is vacant house accommodation in the neighbourhood, and, therefore, really you are not very much congested?—I should not like to say that, as a general proposition.

1664. But in existing cases I am speaking of—simply cases which have taken place. I am not speaking of Glasgow, as a whole?—We have certain areas that are very congested, and the most congested areas, I am afraid, have not been dealt with.

1665. They have not been dealt with hitherto, you mean?—There are areas as congested as any that have been dealt with. They have been gradually getting more congested; under, of course, the operation of former Acts they have been getting more crowded.

1666. But does not the fact that the Secretary for Scotland granted you a dispensation on the ground that there was vacant suitable accommodation in the neighbourhood, rather go to show that the area was not a very congested one?—The areas formerly dealt with had in their neighbourhood a given number of vacant houses, but the areas we have in our mind I am aware have not.

1667. You mean the areas to be dealt with in future?—To be dealt with in future.

1668. And, therefore, although the Secretary for Scotland has given you a dispensation in these previous cases, it does not follow that he will always do so?—By no means.

1669. So that I presume what you would rather ask this Committee to do would be to propose that the model clause is not to apply to you at all in the future?—That is what we would really like.

1670. Then is it not incumbent upon you to suggest to us what restriction you propose to substitute for the model clauses?—I confess I have not thought of that, or I would have consulted my Committee in regard to it. We rather thought that your Lordships' Committee would suggest clauses in view of that.

1671. Which would suit your case?—In the view of deletion of those other ones. We very specially object to having to submit a scheme before we purchase houses by agreement.

1672. That I thoroughly appreciate, but that is outside our scope?—That is yet the case, I think, and still more will be.

1673. But we have not got to do with those cases of agreement; we have only to do with cases in which houses are purchased under Acts of Parliament?—But we require to come to Parliament for power to purchase by agreement; the Corporation

Chairman—continued.

poration have no power to purchase and expend money even by agreement without coming to Parliament; and when we come to Parliament for power to purchase by agreement then we are met with those same model clauses. As I have pointed out to you, it enhances enormously the price we have to pay for the ground, and although proprietors might be perfectly willing to sell us somewhat unsatisfactory houses if they did not know it was the Corporation that was buying—as, of course, we would require to purchase them through an agent—the moment that they know it is the Corporation going under an Act of Parliament, their price is very much larger, and the consequent rent to the people, that is the point, the rent to the working classes, is all the larger.

1674. But when we are asked to make these clauses not applicable to you any longer, it would be a great help to us if we knew the exact restrictions which you propose to substitute?—I would not venture to suggest them just now, but I should be delighted to have a meeting of my Committee and communicate with your Lordship afterwards.

1675. That will be very good of you; I think that would be very much to the point if you would do so. Is that the chief point that you wish to state?—That is the only point which we wish to bring before you: that in regard to housing schemes the Corporation should not be subjected to the operation of the model clauses.

1676. With regard to these insanitary houses, of course you have one remedy within your reach, which is, to declare that if the houses are not put in a condition that you consider sanitary, they are no longer to be let?—That is perfectly true.

1677. Do you put that in force?—Yes, we have put it in force, and we will be able on the 1st of July, by the operation of a private Act of our own, a Building Speculation Act, to put it in force in a more drastic way than we have ever been able to do, but that does not quite meet all the needs of the case.

1678. Then have you mentioned to me really the main point that you want to lay before the Committee?—Yes, the one point that caused us anxiety.

Viscount *Hampden.*

1679. What would be the attitude of your Corporation to a proposal that the actual work, the construction of the houses, not the cost, but the actual construction of the houses, should be placed not upon the railway or other company causing the displacement, but upon the Corporation of the City?—I have not, of course, professed any great interest in the proposal to have more stringent clauses for the railway companies, and I am not quite sure that I apprehend the point of the question. Is it that if a railway company displaces a certain number of inhabitants in the course of their operations, the construction of the new houses should be put in the hands of the Corporation?

1680. Yes, but the cost on the railway company, of course; the cost, by contribution from the railway or other company causing the displacement; the work of reconstruction on the local authority?—I do not think we would be in favour of that. I do not think we would desire to accept the responsibility of that.

Lord *Hatherton.*

1681. How would you provide for the people that you dis-house while you are building the new houses in the future if this model clause does not operate?—By erecting, either on the site or elsewhere at possibly a greater distance than the model clause would permit, fresh houses.

Viscount *Hampden.*

1682. With a temporary displacement, of course, if you had not sufficient houses?—A temporary displacement might lead to a certain amount of temporary inconvenience. We cannot evade that.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1683. Have the railway and other companies displaced many persons of the working class in Glasgow of recent years?—Yes, they have.

1684. Have you any idea of the number?—I should not like to venture.

1685. It is a substantial number?—It is a substantial number.

1686. Is it within your knowledge that the railway companies in Glasgow have purchased much property occupied by persons of the working class by private treaty?—I do not know to what extent the railway companies do it by private treaty or by arbitration; I think they purchase most of it by private treaty.

Chairman.

1687. There is just one question that I should like to have your opinion upon. The clause runs, as it now stands: "The company shall not under this Act purchase or acquire 20 or more houses until they have prepared and put forward a scheme." Supposing it were altered in this way, to make it run: "The company shall not under this Act demolish any houses until they have prepared or put forward a scheme," would that mitigate your objection? I quite understand your position, which is this: that if you were not to enter into any bargain, entirely stopped as you are by the terms of the new Standing Order from beginning the bargain, of course everybody would know what you were going to do, and, of course, the price would be very much raised against you; but supposing the Standing Orders were altered to this extent, that you would be enabled to enter into a bargain of purchasing and acquiring, but still you were simply stopped from demolishing until your scheme was approved of by the Secretary for Scotland, how would that suit you?—But the third paragraph of the model clause says that every scheme under this——

1688. But I am not dealing with that point. If you look, please, at sub-section (1) it says: "The company shall not purchase or acquire 20 or more houses," and I am suggesting to you that if it were worded: "The Corporation shall not demolish any houses," and so on, then if you were going to build on another site and Standing Order only stopped you from demolishing any houses, would that mitigate your objection?—It would lessen it considerably. There are easily conceivable circumstances, however, in which that would not meet the case. The scheme, for example, might not be approved of; that is perfectly possible; it might not be approved of for any reason—for example, because it was to be on

Chairman—continued.

the same site—and the objection might be, "You cannot carry out this scheme without displacing them, and we cannot allow that," or because the scheme was to be on another site, and it might be said, "That will be too far away"—something of that kind. And it seems to us that we are being hampered in one of the most important and beneficent operations of the corporation by unnecessary red tape where we know the circumstances, are on the spot, and know the needs and conditions, and sympathise with the people far more truly than any (I speak with all respect of Lord Balfour) Secretary for Scotland could do.

1689. Then am I suggesting anything unfair if I ask you whether your view would be that it would be better that you should be subject to no restrictions whatever? I rather gather that from the general tendency of what you say?—Perhaps that might be too strong a statement to make, that we wish to be entirely exempt: we do not wish to do anything outwith the full knowledge and approval of Parliament, and we would have all our proposals in our Bill which would come before Parliament, but it is the arbitrary imposition of not so much the Standing Order as the interpretation of the Standing Order to which we object. The model clause is not the Standing Order, but the interpretation of it on the part of the officials, and in the Standing Order itself we do not see anything so very objectionable, but it is this official interpretation of the Standing Order as contained in the model clause that bothers us.

1690. Then you have undertaken to kindly send me your interpretation of the Standing Order that would be suitable?—I will be very glad to have a meeting of the Committee and submit it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. EDGAR JOSIAH HARPER is called in; and Examined, as follows:

Chairman.

1691. You are the statistical officer of the London County Council?—I am.

1692. And have you been deputed by the London County Council to attend here?—By the Parliamentary Committee of that Council.

1693. And may I take it that anything you say to this Committee will have been approved of by that Committee previously?—I shall endeavour to keep within my instructions, but I may have to qualify things that I say as my own personal opinion.

1694. What we wish especially to know is, any definite proposals which your Parliamentary Committee may wish to make for the amendment of the Standing Orders. With regard to past Bills, I am not aware that there is any particular object in going into particular cases unless there is anything very special indeed of a kind which we have not heard of before, which you wish to lay before us. Is there anything of that sort?—The only point, and it is one of detail, I can state in a sentence; that is, that the Tube Railway Bills, of which there is so large a number now before Parliament, schedule property in two ways, that is to say, some of it they schedule in order that they may acquire it compulsorily, and other property in order that they may obtain a compulsory easement under it. There is nothing on the face of the plans, the Bill, or the book of reference to show this distinction, and I suggest that it would be an advantage that there should be, namely:—that there should be two schedules in their statement, one giving the plan numbers of the properties which may be acquired by compulsory powers, and another giving the plan numbers of properties under which easements only are to be taken.

1695. Has a suggestion of that kind ever been made to the Lord Chairman of Committees, to whose department matters of that kind more especially belong?—So far as I am aware, it has not.

1696. Now the return that you mention, the schedule which the company are obliged to put in when they are proposing a Bill to Parliament, is laid before the Lord Chairman, and is sent to the Home Office, is it not?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

1697. If that return were at the same time sent to the County Council, would that not meet the objection that the local authority, whatever it may be, in this case the County Council, has been unable thoroughly to test the accuracy of the returns as to the property and persons who are being displaced?—With submission, I would hardly put it so high as an objection, but it certainly is desirable that a little more time should be allowed than at present for the checking of these statements. They have to be deposited, and they generally are deposited on the 31st of December, and it is possible that action on the Standing Orders would have to be taken as early as the following 9th of January, which obviously allows far too little time for checking a statement which might deal with hundreds of houses.

1698. We have been told, I think, by the railway companies, that there would be no objection to sending that return to the local authority, at the same time that it was sent to the central authority?—I have no doubt they would be willing to facilitate the public interest.

1699. And that would assist you very much?—It would, undoubtedly.

1700. Is there any special recommendation or alteration which you wish to lay before the Committee? Take the Standing Order, and point out anything you wish to us?—There is one other small point, which is, that, in computing the number of persons displaced, if a house is empty and suitable for occupation by persons of the working class, it should be counted in in some way; and I suggest, in accordance with what I believe is the Home Office practice, that each room in such empty house should be reckoned as if it accommodated two persons.

1701. It has been suggested to us that the population

Chairman—continued.

population of a house should be limited to the population which can be accommodated by that house under the health laws in force in the district. What do you say to that suggestion?—That, no doubt, is a most useful suggestion, and, I believe, the one which I make would, roughly, although not scientifically, arrive at the same end. The surveyors advising the Home Office, both Mr. Steward, at present, and the late Mr. Cubitt-Nichols, for many years past adopted that rule of two to a room, and it appears to work out fairly in accordance with the health laws.

1702. I believe a proposal has been under the consideration of the County Council, that promoters, in lieu of rehousing, should make a money payment?—Yes; I think that was submitted to your Lordship's Committee by Dr. Collins, who quoted the resolution passed by the Council to that effect.

1703. Would you suggest that that arrangement should be made compulsorily upon promoters, or merely that it should be optional, that they might, in lieu of their undertaking to build houses, make a payment in money?—I attach considerable value to the principle of uniformity in these matters, and that is my main reason for suggesting that it should be compulsory rather than optional.

1704. And would you propose that that arrangement should take place, irrespective of the fact that there was, or was not, vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood?—Yes; I think the question of the destruction of accommodation suitable for persons of the labouring class is so serious, that, when such accommodation is destroyed, the mere existence of other similar accommodation, within a certain radius, should not be taken to excuse the people destroying that accommodation from the liability to provide an equivalent amount somewhere. Obviously, they should not be compelled, in fairness, to provide that accommodation in a very dear neighbourhood, where it would cost them a great deal; but out in the suburbs, where, possibly, the scheme might be almost self-supporting, there seems to be no reason why they should not provide, at least, the amount of accommodation equivalent to that which they destroy.

Viscount *Hampden.*

1705. In cash or in kind?—If they made the payment in cash, they would do it through the body to whom that payment was made.

Chairman.

1706. Then you would be in favour of taking away that, if I may so call it, dispensing power, which is at present possessed by the Home Office?—I think so. I believe the only reason for that dispensing power has been the undoubted hardship, of which I have personal experience, of the working of the Standing Orders, when applied to a body which is not in any way fitted for the provision of housing accommodation. A railway company, and, similarly, the Improvements Committee of the Council, with whose work I am very familiar, are engaged, the

Chairman—continued.

railway company in making the railway and the Improvements Committee in making a new street, and not in housing. Of course, the restriction put upon them by the present Standing Orders hinders the carrying out of what, after all, is their main function. If they could be rid of that simply by means of making a money payment, their primary function would be very much better fulfilled, and, I believe, with a considerable saving of time; while, the obligation being handed over to one central body, there would be no hardship in dealing with every single person displaced, because you could deal with a case of half-a-dozen people in conjunction with another case of a few hundreds, perhaps, and provide for the whole of them. At present, when you are dealing with a railway company which only displaces six persons, it is absurd to ask that company to rehouse six persons; but if you are dealing, say, with ten different cases of varying numbers, totalling up to about 100, it is surely desirable that you should get a block of dwellings erected for 100 people, and you can do it in the way I suggest.

1707. You said that you would be in favour of this payment being made to the London County Council in the case of London, or to the municipal authority of the particular district in which the dishousing took place?—My instructions are, of course, to suggest the London County Council, and, personally, I think at the present time it would be best to make an arrangement in that way, because the London County Council is the only municipal body in London which has a regular staff continually at work upon the provision of new dwellings. One or two Borough Councils have provided dwellings in the past, or are contemplating doing so in the future; but none of them is continually engaged upon it, and, therefore, they have not the machinery in going order; they would have to create it for each particular purpose, and that, of course, causes delay and difficulty and cost.

1708. But, supposing they have, at some subsequent date (this Standing Order would, of course, be for all time, according to your plan), established such a body of officials as you mention, who would be competent to deal with the question of rehousing, should you still be in favour of giving it to the County Council to do and not to the Borough Council?—That point has not been considered by the committee of the Council. My personal opinion would be that if the work grew to be so very large, it might be desirable to have concurrent jurisdiction, that is to say, that the Borough Councils and the County Council should pool their energies in this matter.

1709. Then, where would you draw the line of jurisdiction between the County Council and the Borough Councils?—On the spur of the moment it is difficult to formulate a scheme, but I can quite conceive it possible, in the case, for instance, of the Borough Council of Shoreditch, which has already built dwellings, that, if there should be need for rehousing a number of persons connected with Shoreditch, and the London

Chairman—continued.

County Council has its hands very full, and its housing staff practically overworked, an arrangement could be made between the two bodies, whereby Shoreditch should deal with that particular matter.

1710. But, supposing for the sake of argument, that the London County Council staff was not so busily employed, and supposing that the Shoreditch staff was not so busily employed, to which of the two authorities should you give this right of receiving this money payment?—The central authority, undoubtedly.

1711. Which do you call the central authority?—The London County Council, because obviously they would have a great deal more of the work, and, therefore, a great deal more experience.

1712. But now to take this very instance that you have mentioned—by way of illustration, because you mention it—to take the case of Shoreditch, as you say they are actually engaged in this very work?—They have been; they are not at present.

1713. What is your reason for proposing that Shoreditch should not receive that money, and that the London County Council should?—Simply that the London County Council would be better fitted to make the best use of the money. The work of providing dwellings is a very difficult work from the financial side. It is extremely difficult to know what will be the class of building best suited to meet the needs of the people in a particular locality, and especially their pockets. Now, the London County Council have for years past been engaged in providing these dwellings, and they know not only so well what to do, but what to avoid, which is even more important; they have learned, of course, by their experience in the past, in a way that no Borough Council can possibly have learned at present; and I think it would be better, therefore, to leave the administration of such a matter as this in the hands of the central authority, if one has to make a choice between the London County Council and the Borough Councils.

1714. Is there any other point that you would like to put before us?—I think it would be germane to point out that the London County Council, in 1898, bound themselves by a standing resolution to provide accommodation for at least as many persons as they might displace by their operations for the future; up to that time they had simply carried out the Standing Orders, and they then passed a resolution to say that they would do something more—namely, rehouse as many people as they displaced.

1715. Not less, that is to say?—Yes, not less than.

1716. Is there anything further you would like to say?—I think not.

Earl *Carrington.*

1717. I believe you have had experience on both sides of this question, that is, experience of the application of these Standing Orders to schemes promoted by the London County Council, and experience on the other hand in

Earl *Carrington*—continued.

testing the returns of other promoters?—Yes, I have had to advise the Council on the carrying out of the Standing Orders when they displaced persons, when I was in the Valuers' Department. Now I am statistical officer, and it is one of my duties to test, as far as I can, the statements deposited by promoters as to probable displacements in London, so that I have experience on both sides of the hedge.

1718. In the figures that you have given of proposed displacements under schemes submitted to Parliament in the last three sessions, do they relate to the County of London only?—I am only dealing with the County of London throughout.

1719. Would these figures be the results of your own investigations, or are they merely a compilation from the statements deposited by the companies?—Your Lordship is referring no doubt to the figures put in by Dr. Collins as to displacements shown in the last two sessions. Those figures are not the figures deposited by the promoters—the railway companies; they are the result of inquiries at the Census Office as to the number of people occupying those particular houses in 1891. But in no case is there any large difference between the figures so arrived at and the figures deposited by the railway companies.

1720. Have you ever known any serious discrepancies between your figures and those deposited by the promoters in any particular case?—There have been in the past, but the railway companies are very much more careful now than they were say 20 or even 10 years ago.

1721. Would the result of these tables show that a considerable number of persons are liable to displacement without any rehousing provision being made for them under the Standing Orders as they exist at present?—Yes; the effect of these figures is to show the result of the 20 houses limit. Under that limitation in the schemes of 1900, 750 persons could have been displaced without any obligation to re-house, and in the 1901 schemes 899 persons. I have now the figures for the 1902 schemes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1722. Schemes or scheme?—That is the total schemes submitted to Parliament, and there it amounts to 993 persons. The whole of those persons may be displaced, and there is no obligation on anyone to provide accommodation for them.

Earl *Carrington.*

1723. Of course you know the London County Council bound themselves to provide accommodation for at least as many persons as they displace?—Yes.

1724. Can you tell the Committee the circumstances under which that resolution came to be passed?—A new council was elected, I think in the year 1898, when the Housing Committee appointed by that council undertook a special inquiry into the whole subject. They found that it was the practice of the council to do as railway companies did, or very little better, that is to say, to comply with the Standing Order as interpreted by the Government Department and no more; and they found,

as

Earl *Carrington*—continued.

as I am now telling the Committee, that the result of that was to leave a considerable margin of displaced persons without any corresponding accommodation. After full consideration of the subject the Housing Committee took up a resolution to the council, which was passed by the council on the 29th November, 1898.

1725. Am I correct in thinking that the main point of the suggestions that you have made, and which has been submitted to this Committee by Dr. Collins, is that railway companies and other promoters similarly circumstanced are not suitable instruments for the provision of housing accommodation?—As I have informed the noble Chairman, a railway company is primarily constituted for building and working a railway, and not for providing housing accommodation; and to compel them to do that, is, to a certain extent, to put an awkward and harassing obligation upon them, and one which they would no doubt gladly be freed from.

1726. I do not know whether you can answer this question, but do you think that the railway companies would agree to such a transfer of their obligations as you suggest?—I am not, of course, able to speak for the railway companies, but seeing that if the suggestion was carried out they would save time and be relieved of a good deal of worry and embarrassment, I think they probably would welcome it.

1727. I believe the London County Council have in several cases been unable to proceed with the erection of dwellings under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act on sites which could easily have been built on with some small contribution in aid of the cost such as you now suggest?—Yes, that arises in this way: The London County Council, in building dwellings under Part III. as distinct from re-housing, have bound themselves that they will not undertake any scheme unless the financial side of that scheme is such that no charge will be brought upon the ratepayers. That of course rules out a good many sites in neighbourhoods where dwelling accommodation is very much required; and if there were such a series of contributions to the Council's Housing Fund from promoters as I have just been suggesting, no doubt these schemes could go forward and be used not only for re-housing *pro tanto*, but there would be a margin for the provision of altogether new accommodation.

1728. Which could be applied in other cases?—Which could be applied in other cases, or—it is not necessary so to apply it—the increase of housing accommodation in London *per se* is desirable.

1729. What is your experience with regard to the locality of rehousing; is it always necessary to provide the new accommodation within a short distance of the area of displacement?—In my experience it is seldom necessary. There are exceptional cases; for instance, in the Holborn to Strand improvement, now being carried out by the London County Council, a number of Covent Garden Market workers and persons engaged in the theatres are displaced, and their hours of labour being in one case very early in the morning, and in the other very late at night, it is practically essential that they should live in or

Earl *Carrington*—continued.

near the spot. But that is an exceptional case. In the majority of instances the persons displaced do not go to the dwellings which are provided for them, and, that being so, it only becomes a question of providing an equivalent amount of accommodation to that destroyed. Consequently, so long as that provision is made in the county of London, the movement of population generally will make it generally available.

1730. Do you think that if the provision of housing accommodation to meet these displacements were controlled by one authority, it would be possible to effect considerable savings by the erection of dwellings in the suburbs, rather than in the business districts, where land is so dear?—That is how I hope it will work out. As I have just said, I think we could spread the whole of the rehousing operations in London so equably over the county of London, that there would be, after a few years' working of this scheme, no special pressure (or I hope not) in any particular district, such as now exists.

1731. And you think the amount of such savings would be considerable?—One has the experience of the Council's own operations. The Council has in hand an unusual number of large and costly street improvements, and several schemes under the Housing Act, and if they were able to have the benefit of this suggestion in all those schemes now being carried out, I estimate that they would be able to save at least half a million of money, because they would be able to house the people as a whole, taking the average, on cheaper land.

1732. And while this half million of money was saved, it might be possible to provide accommodation for even larger numbers of persons than those actually displaced?—Yes; I think it would be often economical to buy a larger site than was absolutely essential for the actual number of persons that you have to deal with, and then you would have a margin, which would pay itself, for the accommodation of others.

1733. Was there not an evasion of the Standing Order in the case of Broad Street Buildings?—That has been before the Committee.

1734. Then that should be made impossible for the future?—Clearly.

1735. And therefore it becomes necessary to deal, at any rate to some extent, with displacements effected by private persons?—That is really my excuse for putting into the heads of evidence, which I have handed in, certain figures as to displacements by private persons during the past 18 months.

1736. Do you attach importance to the checking of the statements deposited by promoters before their Bills are considered by Parliament, as well as to the investigation which now takes place before the rehousing scheme is approved by the Government Department?—Yes, I do. I think the investigation carried out by the Government Department is very searching and thorough, but it does not take place, so far as my experience goes, until the Act has been passed, and it is necessary for the promoters to go to the Home Secretary with a scheme making the

Earl *Carrington*—continued.

provision required by the model clause. The point of my suggestion is that there should be an opportunity for the testing of the statement of the number of persons to be displaced before the Bill becomes an Act.

1737. Then, of course, you think that a longer period should be allowed for the examination of these statements than is now permitted under the Standing Orders?—Yes, I have already told the noble Chairman.

1738. Would there be any difficulty in having those statements deposited at the same time as the plans and books of reference?—None whatever. I have had many years' experience in preparing books of reference, and also these particular statements, and the inquiries which it is necessary to make; both are made up by the same officers, and at the same time; and, as the book of reference is deposited on the 30th November, there is really no difficulty in depositing the labouring class statement at the same time.

1739. There is only one more question I will ask you; that is, I understand that you agree with previous witnesses that the form of the statement should be more definite than at present, in order to facilitate the checking that you suggest?—Yes; I especially wish to endorse Mr. Kershaw's suggestion, that the postal address of each house should be given.

Viscount *Hampden.*

1740. You have made a very important proposal with regard to the reconstruction of houses by the local authority. I gather from your evidence that you consider this will conduce to simplicity and uniformity of practice?—Yes.

1741. That would get rid entirely of any limit, either 10 houses or 20 houses, and just make it in this manner compulsory in every case upon the railway or other company to pay a fine, even if one house is taken?—Yes, my object is to secure that there shall be no displacement whatever without corresponding accommodation.

1742. In fact, that would work as part of the purchase price of the house taken?—It practically does so work now; but, in addition to paying the price, a price which is probably greater than would have to be paid under this suggestion, the railway company have all the worry and delay incident to the discharge of a duty for which they are not specially well fitted.

1743. They would get rid of a work which is not really their business?—Exactly.

1744. The Chairman put to you a question with respect to the London County Council, and the borough councils of London. I suppose you will admit that when the borough councils become more experienced and the constitution of these borough councils more developed, it might be desirable to decentralise in such a matter?—I think the door should always be kept open for that, but to make it general might perhaps lead to difficulty. Take, for instance, the case of Marylebone. The borough council of Marylebone is hardly likely to have any sites in its area upon which dwellings could be erected so as to avoid a charge upon the rates. Therefore, if you give the power to the borough councils generally

Viscount *Hampden*—continued

it would only be exercised in those districts of London where housing accommodation is required.

1745. I meant, of course, that the door should be kept open. I suppose you will agree with me that, looking at the present constitution of the borough councils, that constitution would not inspire you with sufficient confidence to give them such very important work as this. At the present time they are inexperienced young bodies, and their constitution is not one which inspires one with much confidence for such a work as that?—I have not looked at it from the point of view of the constitution of the borough councils, as to which I am hardly competent to speak. I look at it from the practical point of view that they have had, with the exception of Shoreditch and, I think, one other, no practical experience of the provision of dwellings. That is a most important point. Had they had such experience, then of course there is always a certain advantage in having a body which is confined to a particular small area to supervise what goes on in that area. I think, whatever happened, that the borough councils would be interested in this matter, and would be the first probably to call upon the County Council to discharge whatever duties might be put upon them by Parliament in this connection, and if the London County Council did not do their duty they would see to it, by deputations and other forms of pressure, that the work was carried out.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1746. You alluded to the fact that the County Council have had great experience in the housing of the people, and that the borough councils, with the exception of Shoreditch, have had little, if any, experience. Can you tell me how many of the borough councils have housing committees?—No, I could not give you that information offhand.

1747. You have no idea as to whether every one has or whether housing committees are not common among all the borough councils?—I should presume that a committee to deal with such subjects as displacement would exist in every borough, but if by a housing committee you mean a housing committee charged with the provision of dwellings for persons of the working class, then I do not think many borough councils have such a committee.

1748. Are not the borough councils required by law now to deal with the housing question under the Housing Acts?—The additional power conferred upon them and the London County Council by the Act which extended the Housing Act (I forget the date) a year or two ago, was this mainly: it gave both the London County Council and the borough councils power to acquire sites and provide dwellings outside their own special areas.

1749. Therefore that Act would meet the case of Marylebone which you referred to a minute ago?—Yes, it would.

1750. Do you think that the County Council is more competent to judge of the local needs and wants

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

wants in any particular district of London than the local borough council?—The actual needs and wants of the particular persons displaced would always be ascertained by a house to house inquiry, and that can be more readily done by a body which has a regular staff continually doing it than by a body which would have to employ someone specially to do it for them. That is my only reason for employing a central body in that connection.

1751. Then you think that the borough councils have no permanent staff for watching that question?—I think that is obvious; they have to employ their sanitary inspectors, whose primary duties are of another kind.

1752. But are not the sanitary inspectors practically the Housing Committee in the sense of the Public Health Act?—They can be employed on these inquiries, of course, and they are sometimes; but there is nothing corresponding in the staff of a borough council to the staff in my department. At the present time I have seven or eight inquiry officers, as they are called, who are doing nothing but making inquiries of this character.

1753. You mentioned the case of Broad Street. Did those inquiry officers of the London County Council ascertain the action of the railway company in that case?—They made inquiries as to the actual facts of the case as soon as public attention was drawn to it. But I do not wish to claim the credit of discovering that case—quite the contrary.

1754. May I ask whether the County Council heard of that case from the borough council in the first instance?—Personally I cannot say absolutely, but communications had passed between the borough council and the County Council in that case.

1755. Are you not aware of the fact that the County Council took no action in that case until nearly a year after the matter had come to Parliament?—I think up to the present time even the Council cannot be said to have taken action, because they have no power, but they were deeply interested in the matter and they obtained all the information they could.

1756. You suggested that the County Council had had more experience on the question of rehousing than the borough councils?—I think it is obvious.

1757. Because the borough councils were constituted later than the County Council?—No, not only that, but because the County Council deals with a very much larger area than any one borough council.

1758. Is it not the fact that some vestries in London, before they were converted into borough councils, were actively engaged in treating the housing question?—The Shoreditch Vestry.

1759. The Vestry of Shoreditch were engaged, and are not now engaged in housing?—They are not now engaged in actual building of dwellings; no doubt they have the subject always under consideration; in a constituency like Shoreditch it is practically necessary.

1760. But you are not aware whether any actual schemes are in hand now?—By a borough council, you mean?

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

1761. Yes?—I think the City of Westminster has one in hand.

1762. And Shoreditch?—I have not the particulars of it.

1763. I believe there is one. Then, may I ask whether the attention of the London County Council has ever been seriously called by the Home Office to the fact that the County Council was acting or not acting up to its rehousing obligations?—I cannot recall an instance at the present moment of such a thing being done.

1764. Does not the Thames Tunnel Act at all bear upon my question—certain clauses in that Act? Has there been no correspondence on the subject between the Home Office and the London County Council?—No doubt there has been considerable correspondence in connection with that; but in the Blackwall Tunnel the Home Office had no reason to complain of inaction on the part of the London County Council, seeing that we provided there for almost as many persons as we displaced, although that was before the date of the resolution of 1898, to which I have referred.

1765. But you cannot tell me as to whether there has been any somewhat vigorously worded letter by the Home Office to the County Council on the subject of the County Council's action or inaction in regard to rehousing under the displacements created by its schemes?—Of course, it is dealing with history of some years back, and it is difficult to carry one's memory so far, but the County Council were always anxious to proceed with the housing scheme in connection with the Blackwall Tunnel displacement as fast as possible, because the scheme approved by the Home Secretary was so worded that they were unable to take all the steps necessary to open the tunnel to the public until the accommodation, or a certain proportion of it, had been provided; therefore, their interest was wholly in the same direction as that of the Home Office.

1766. But, so far as I can understand from your answers, it would appear that there have been discussions and not quite agreement on that subject between the surveyors of the Home Office and the London County Council?—I should not like to be taken as saying that; I am only saying that I cannot recall anything of the kind; my memory is not of the best, and I should not like to deny it absolutely; that is the only reason for my putting it in that form.

1767. The hands of the London County Council are very full, are they not, in the matter of housing at the present time?—It is a mere matter of organisation; the larger amount of work you do the better and cheaper you ought to be able to do it.

1768. In your evidence you stated that 500,000*l.* might have been saved if the suggestions that you made were carried out?—Yes.

1769. And you wish that money to go to the County Council and not to the borough councils; that would be your desire?—I wish that money, which comes out of the pockets of the ratepayers, to be saved altogether and kept in their pockets—it is not a matter of one council or another.

1770. So you do not attach importance to whether it is paid into the County Council coffers or the borough council's coffers?—It would not be paid at all; that is my point: it would not require

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

quire to be raised; therefore, the question of the body concerned is immaterial.

1771. How do you mean, not required to be raised?

Chairman.] The cost would be 500,000*l.* less, is what he means?

Witness.] Exactly.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1772. In other words, it would be a contribution on the part of promoters of Private Bills, in your estimation, in relief of the rates?—I think I see now the point in your mind. The half million that I was referring to would have been saved, because it is expenditure that the ratepayers have to meet; but you are transferring my illustration to the case of a railway company.

1773. Quite so?—In that case I think the railway company should bear the actual cost of the necessary provision, so far as it is not self-supporting; and, under the suggestions I am making, I believe the railway company would save money, but I do not think they would save anything like, in any one scheme, the half million that I have given you, because that is an exceptional figure arising mainly from the circumstances of the Holborn to Strand improvement, where it costs the Council actually 215*l.* a head for land alone, to rehouse the persons that have to be rehoused, by order of the Home Secretary, on the spot.

Viscount *Hampden.*

1774. It is the change of site?—Yes. We have enormously enhanced the value of that particular land by our improvement.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1775. I have only one more question to ask you. You do not agree with the statement that has been made to the Committee by several other witnesses, if I remember rightly—anyhow it is the opinion held by some, that the displacement by promoters of Private Bills, including the railway companies, is practically a small affair?—No; I think the actual figures show that it is not a small affair.

1776. On page 3 of your statement, you say that a rough calculation made by you last year shows that during the past 25 years about 200,000 persons of the labouring class have been displaced in London, 100,000 compulsorily under Acts of Parliament, while new accommodation has only been provided for about 70,000; that is, compulsorily displaced under Private Bills?—Under Private Bills and schemes under the Housing Act.

1777. Could you at all divide the numbers?—Yes, I think I can.

1778. Perhaps you will put the figures in?—Yes, if you will allow me.

1779. In any case you attach considerable importance to this displacement by Private Bill promoters?—Yes.

1780. You think it is an evil of considerable magnitude?—Yes, I do, indeed.

1781. And not only the actual displacement under Bills, but the displacement which takes

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

place by private purchases, and, if I might use the word without offence, evasions of the obligation in some cases?—Yes.

Chairman.

1782. Just one question to clear up one of your answers. You said with reference to your proposals that that money should be paid by the railway companies to the County Council direct; but that you wished to keep the door open, so that in the event of the borough councils acquiring more experience, and being more able to deal with such a subject, the receipt of that fund should be transferred to them. Now, by what means should you propose to keep the door open in this Standing Order, or, rather, to prevent it from shutting itself?—If your Lordship would allow me, I should prefer to take a little time to think of that subject; I had not considered it until your Lordship put it to me; but I personally attach considerable importance to every possible means of facilitating co-operation between the London County Council and the borough councils in this question of rehousing.

1783. Perhaps you would kindly send to us the form in which your ideas could be inserted in the Standing Order?—I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. *Bond.*

1784. With regard to one paragraph in your statement to which Mr. Hay has already drawn your attention, viz., this rough calculation of yours about the number of people who have been displaced in London during the last 25 years, 200,000 you say of the labouring classes have been displaced, of whom 100,000 have been compulsorily under Acts of Parliament, while new accommodation has only been provided for about 70,000, what is the meaning of "new accommodation" in that paragraph?—I mean new accommodation *ad hoc*, that is to say, accommodation provided by promoters under schemes approved by the Home Office in the usual way.

1785. You do not mean to suggest that in the last 25 years new accommodation has only been provided throughout the whole length and breadth of London for 100,000?—No, certainly not.

1786. I think the paragraph is open to that construction, and I want to get it set quite right?—I certainly do not wish to convey that impression.

1787. You mean when you say that 100,000 persons have been displaced under schemes which contained or might have contained rehousing provision, only 70,000, as a matter of fact, have been provided for under those schemes in the way of new accommodation?—Yes, so that a fringe of 30,000 persons during the past 25 years has not been provided for owing to the limitations of the present Standing Order.

1788. On an average a little over 1,000 a year?—Yes.

1789. That is not very important, is it?—I think it is important.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. JAMES WALSH is called in; and Examined, as follows:

Chairman.

1790. I BELIEVE you appear here to represent a working class association with reference to this Standing Order?—Yes.

1791. And you yourself are, I think, actively engaged in business?—Yes, I am a tinplate worker, working at the bench.

1792. And you are a member of the Executive Committee of the Workmen's National Housing Council?—Yes.

1793. You yourself have made personal inquiries. You reside in the borough of Shoreditch?—At the time that the Broad Street clearance was undertaken I was a resident.

1794. And you were an eye witness, of course, of those clearances?—Yes.

1795. Will you tell us the impression that those clearances made upon your mind from the facts you saw as relating to the working classes?—At the time the Broad Street clearance was proposed, along with other members of a local political body, I made inquiries for political purposes, to speak truthfully, as to just what effect this clearance might have upon the people residing there; and while I have not the names and actual facts with me at present, I might state briefly my impression in these matters.

1796. Will you please do so, in a general way?—That while quite a number of people did not seem to be at all inconvenienced by the fact of their being expected to remove, on the other hand I met with several very extreme cases where considerable inconvenience would be experienced, and considerable financial loss would be the result of these people having to move from where they had been living for a large number of years. Some of the people who lived in this district worked in the immediate neighbourhood, and from their own statements they had made inquiries as to the possibility of their getting accommodation in that neighbourhood, and they found that it was in some cases impossible for such accommodation to be got, and in others for accommodation to be got at rents at all in proportion to those which they had been paying; and the result of several other inquiries that were made was that people who had been living in that district for periods ranging from six to 12 years had been forced to go as far out as Edmonton, Walthamstow, Enfield, and places of that description; and, I think, judging of the effects upon the whole, that a great hardship was inflicted upon the people who resided in this particular spot; and as the Council whom I represent here this morning have considered this question, together with other similar clearance schemes undertaken by the School Board, the County Council, railway companies, and private individuals, we are convinced that the Standing Order which governs these matters does not provide a sufficient protection for cases of this description, and we wish respectfully to submit what, in our opinion, would be an improvement upon the present arrangement. While this case of Broad Street, I believe, was an instance where they practically evaded the Standing Order itself by getting possession of the site by some private agency

Chairman—continued.

rather than by direct contract themselves, nevertheless the effect of clearance schemes generally is that they aggravate the already existing overcrowding; and, as far as possible, we would wish that the Standing Order governing this question of clearance should be modified to the extent that there should be no limit practically as to the number of houses, the taking of which imposes rehousing schemes, after the experience we have had even with the London School Board, who have scheduled, for instance, quite a number of houses in the aggregate, perhaps mounting up to 50 or 60; but they have gone about it in such a way that they have taken, perhaps, 18 houses in Hackney and 16 houses in another district, thereby escaping the Standing Order itself, and aggravating, as I have said, a very bad condition of things. Our main point with regard to this is, that there should be no limit whatever as to the number of houses entailed in a clearance scheme which should impose the rehousing condition.

1797. Taken within what area—do you mean the metropolis?—The metropolis.

1798. You would make that the area; you would enlarge the area from boroughs or parishes to the whole metropolis?—Yes.

1799. Please continue?—With regard to the rehousing authority, we are convinced, from experience, that railway companies are not quite the proper people to undertake housing schemes of this description. We feel that the local authority—I might say the Borough Council, where it is possible to house within their own district, or the County Council, where it is a question of having to go outside the district—should, after having been guaranteed payment, undertake the rehousing of any people who might be displaced as a result of these clearance schemes. I think that these points have been contained in a Bill which has been promoted by the Council I represent, and has been introduced on several occasions into Parliament by Dr. Macnamara. That is the only point of which I can think for the moment. I shall be glad to further explain any point that I, perhaps, have not made quite clear.

1800. You say that you would have these new buildings erected either by the County Council or by the Borough Council, as the case might be. Would you propose that they should fix the rent?—I certainly think that the local authority should fix the rent of houses either erected by themselves or erected by a railway company, or by private individuals, as the result of any clearance scheme that might have been undertaken; because we find from experience that there is a tendency for rents to be regulated by the rents existing in a district rather than by that rent which would be justified by the cost of building, and so forth; and we feel that the local authority would be the best judge in a case of that description, and more qualified to put on what we consider to be a fair rent.

1801. Then would you leave it to the local authority to determine the principles on which they would lease these houses?—Yes; I would leave it entirely to the local authority.

1802. You

Chairman—continued.

1802. You would not, for instance, impose upon them any condition that the rents were to bear any proportion to the rents of the houses which had been demolished, or anything of that kind?—While I would like to see that taken into consideration, our experience is that generally where housing conditions are carried out with anything approaching business-like methods, it is possible to house people at rents bearing some proportion, at least, to the houses they occupied previously; and, while we would wish to impose some condition of that description, we are fairly well satisfied that houses can be built and can be let at a rent in proportion, at least, to that which has been paid previously.

1803. If you leave the County Council or the Borough Council to settle the rents entirely free from conditions, it is natural, is it not, to suppose that they would propose rents which would bear some proportion at all events to the outlay which they had incurred, and would be guided by that rather than by other principles?—Quite so.

1804. But you would leave it to them?—Quite so.

1805. Now, with regard to the area within which this new accommodation should be provided, have you any strong views as to the locality of that accommodation—as to whether it shall be, say, within half a mile, or some short distance, of the work; or should you be prepared to accept a larger area, trusting to underground railways and tramways, and things of that sort, to accommodate the people?—We think that both might be done. We think that where it is a pressing case, and, of course, where it is possible to house people within half a mile of the place which is being cleared, it should be done; but we think, on the other hand, that quite a number of people are to be found in congested areas, or in places where it is necessary to have clearance schemes of any description, who might very well, with advantage to themselves, go further out, and could, without any inconvenience, live on the outskirts, provided that travelling facilities and so forth were afforded. Therefore, I think the conditions in most cases should regulate it. Of course, the possibilities should regulate first where the rehousing should be done, whether within a half-mile area or not.

1806. I suppose you are very much alive to the evil of increased congestion?—Yes.

1807. And that in the event of the congestion being increased by providing houses very close to the original site you would be prepared to go a little further out rather than incur the danger which would arise from increasing the congestion?—Quite so.

Mr. *Bond.*

1808. I did not quite understand one thing. Do I gather that you think, as things are now, if a displacement takes place new houses can be put up which can be let at a rent such as the displaced people could afford to pay, and yet return any reasonable commercial interest on the outlay?—We are convinced, taking the examples provided by the County Council, for instance, that housing accommodation can be provided—

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

of course, after making allowance for the improved accommodation, as compared with that which has been left, at rents which are possible and are being paid by the working classes to-day. But our main contention is that where it is left entirely to the railway company, they are more inclined to take into consideration the rents that are being paid in the district than simply the question as to making the thing pay, and allowing a fair proportion of profit.

1809. But I understood that you preferred the County Council as the authority for that purpose to the railway company?—Certainly.

1810. But you are aware, are you not, that it is one of the directions to the people who fix the rents for County Council buildings that they should take that into account?—I was not aware of that fact. I understand the conditions now are that the County Council regulate their rents according to the cost of the building itself, after making an allowance for a fair margin of profit and so forth, to pay for sinking fund and such like.

1811. That, of course, is one of the considerations which they have to take into account, but they also have to take into account the prevailing rent in the district?—I did not understand that.

1812. You are aware that the London County Council has to make something a trifle under 4 per cent. upon its outlay to fulfil its own condition?—Yes.

1813. Have you made any comparison with rents charged in County Council dwellings and in other dwellings put up by companies or private individuals?—Yes, we have devoted considerable attention to that question, and while we think that the County Council could do much more than they are doing, we are perfectly satisfied, comparing the dwellings provided by them with the dwellings provided by companies, and comparing the accommodation provided in the two cases, that the County Council compares favourably with any private companies that we know of to-day.

1814. In what respect?—As far as rent and accommodation are concerned.

1815. Do you suggest that the rents are cheaper?—We arrive at our conclusions after comparing the accommodation provided, and so forth.

1816. The actual rent for three rooms I mean to say, and other accommodation—would that be less in the County Council buildings than in the case of buildings put up by companies or private individuals?—No, I know there are private companies who provide accommodation at apparently a much cheaper rate than the County Council; but so far as my knowledge will allow me to express an opinion, I do not think the accommodation is quite as good.

1817. That must be a matter of opinion, of course. But I do not quite understand where the advantage of the County Council taking the matter over comes in if they are not able to give a cheaper accommodation and satisfy the conditions which they necessarily impose upon themselves so as to avoid a loss to the ratepayer?—But from

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

from the workmen's point of view, and from past experience itself we know, for instance, that the conditions which would regulate a railway company in deciding upon the rent, provided it was left entirely to them, would be, as I have said, to take into consideration the rents of the district and to secure as large a profit as they possibly could for the outlay of their money; whereas we understand that an entirely different set of conditions surround a municipal body; that if they erect dwellings under exactly the same conditions as the railway company, the only thing they have to consider in regulating the rent is the amount the buildings have cost, and to provide, of course, for the maintenance and sinking fund and so forth.

1818. But you are speaking of London, are you not?—I am speaking exclusively of London.

1819. In London are you not aware that where the railway company provide accommodation the rents have as a matter of fact been fixed by the scheme which the Secretary of State settles?—I was not aware of that fact.

1820. And that the companies have been complaining of the lowness of the rents which have been fixed—just for the reason that the rents so fixed do not give them a return upon their outlay; that has not come within your knowledge?—No.

Earl *Carrington.*

1821. I gather from what you have said that you are in favour of rehousing in the suburbs in certain cases?—Yes.

1822. Do you think that the large schemes now being carried out by the London County Council at Tottenham, Tooting, and elsewhere show that there is great need for such accommodation in the suburbs?—Yes, I do.

1823. And, of course, you can get much cheaper rents in the suburbs?—Yes.

1824. As regards the question put by Mr. Bond, is it not considered amongst the working classes, whom you represent, and whom you are well acquainted with—not as an opinion at all, but as a positive fact—that the accommodation provided by the London County Council is far superior to that provided by private companies?—I might say that it is not only my own opinion with regard to this matter, but it is the opinion of the people whom we have canvassed with regard to this point, who occupy some of these dwellings themselves.

1825. It is not a matter of opinion, then, but it is considered a positive fact?—Yes.

Mr. *Claude Hay.*

1826. With reference to Lord Carrington's question about the accommodation provided by the London County Council being superior to that provided by private effort, would you say that the working classes you are in touch with have the same opinion with regard to dwellings supplied by Borough Councils?—The Borough Councils have done so very little in London in the way of housing up to the present that I am hardly in a position to state definitely just what their opinions are; but, speaking strictly with

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

regard to Shoreditch, I am perfectly satisfied that the accommodation provided by the Shoreditch Borough Council will well bear comparison with anything that has been done by even the County Council.

1827. The rents of the dwellings provided by the local authority (be it the Borough Council or the County Council) are in many cases considerably higher, are they not, than the rents asked in dwellings owned by private bodies?—I think that if we take two or three of the private companies we could speak of in London to-day who provide public dwellings, and compare the rents charged by them with the rents charged by the London County Council, the result will bear that impression; but, on the other hand, as I have said, if we take into consideration the accommodation and the nature of the accommodation itself, we feel that the rents charged by the County Council to-day will bear comparison with anything of the kind in London.

1828. Then, in regard to the provision of dwellings in the outskirts of London, of course any benefit which the tenant would derive from the fact of paying a lower rent would be in some measure, if not in great measure, counteracted by the cost in time and money of getting to his work?—That is quite true. You are probably aware that, along with our agitation for the better provision of houses, we consider it absolutely essential that travelling facilities at a low rate should be provided, to make it possible for people to take advantage of such accommodation; but, on the other hand, under present conditions, the men in my own trade, for instance, much prefer living in the suburbs even although it may cost them hours of travelling backwards and forwards in a week, and perhaps a slight amount more in the shape of rent. After putting the railway travelling on the top of his rent, which is rent, he much prefers to travel to living in a congested district. Personally, I do. I have lived, as you know, in Shoreditch, and I have lived in very little accommodation. Now, I can take advantage of the cheap trams and trains, and so forth, which take me out to Tooting and places of that description, and live in fairly comfortable quarters, for a little more than I was paying for living in a crowded district.

1829. In other words, the question of transit in your judgment is one of the chief factors in the solution of the housing question?—It is thought to be as important as the provision of housing itself; the possibility of getting out is a very important consideration.

1830. Your experience among the working classes establishes in your mind clearly that the displacements by private persons, and by the promoters of private Bills, railway companies and others, have reached very appreciable figures?—Yes.

1831. Therefore the subject is not a small one?—No.

1832. Though the actual facts may not have come to public attention?—That is so. For instance, the methods of the London School Board in dealing with this question did not attract anything in the shape of public attention until the matter had been taken up by someone who brought the real facts before the public gaze. We

Mr. *Claude Hay*—continued.

found that they had dishoused something like 1,735 persons, and no one knew anything at all about it, and by the methods that I have already described.

1833. Then this is my last question. It is quite clear in your mind from your experience that in any scheme which is put forward to make good the displacements under the methods that we have described, it is necessary that there should be some provision for the rehousing of at least a percentage of the persons displaced in the immediate neighbourhood of that displacement?—Whenever possible.

1834. In most cases it is absolutely necessary that there should be some?—Yes.

1835. Otherwise certain persons would lose their livelihood?—Yes. There is one other point which I forgot for the moment, which has been raised in the evidence of other witnesses, and that is, with regard to the people who, when the municipality steps in, should do this work. We find by experience that when it is a question of housing within their own immediate locality, the Borough Councils are by degrees recognising their duties in this matter, and are inclined to accept their responsibilities, and do the best they can; but when it is a question, for instance, of making provision outside their own immediate area for people that are dishoused, then considerable difficulty steps in. For instance, I have heard the argument put forward by members of the Shoreditch Borough Council as to the question of rating the property erected outside of their own immediate area. Therefore we feel that the County Council, which is the authority for the whole of London, should be the authority to be looked to in the case of covering the general field, while imposing, so far as we possibly can, the duty upon each Borough Council for their immediate neighbourhoods. We feel that that is a very important point indeed, because, where we have tried to convince and set Borough Councils to work, they joggle us from themselves to the County Council, and the County Council are inclined to say that the Borough Council ought to do it; and between them the duties of rehousing are in many cases lost sight of.

Chairman.

1836. The Borough Councils are naturally anxious about keeping up, at all events, if not increasing, the rateable value of their own area?—Yes, quite so.

1837. So that to a certain extent they would look with less favour on exporting, if I may say so, some of their population to a district which, at present at all events, they have not the power to rate?—Quite so.

Mr. *Bond.*

1838. Upon that question, whether it would pay the Shoreditch Borough Council better to have workmen's dwellings erected within its boundary or to have the space which would be occupied by workmen's dwellings occupied by warehouses or commercial premises, which do you think would work out best from the ratepayers' point of view?—From the ratepayers' point of view I take it that the erection of warehouses is much more profitable to the ratepayers, as a rule, than erecting workmen's dwellings.

1839. It would pay the boroughs really if the workmen got accommodation outside and the space they left vacant were occupied by these commercial and business premises?—I think so, but the point I wish to make clear is that when it comes to a question of not being able to provide within their own area, the Borough Councils—those I have had any transactions with—have a decided objection to housing outside their own immediate area; they say that the County Council, who are the authority for the whole County of London, are the fit people to undertake housing outside their particular district, because the question of rating any property that might be erected outside their area is a very important consideration with them.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. EDWIN LAVERACK is called in; and Examined, as follows:—

Chairman.

1840. You are Town Clerk of Hull?—Yes.

1841. And you are familiar with the Standing Orders which relate to these houses occupied by the labouring classes which are removed under Acts of Parliament?—Yes. I may add that I am deputed by the Association of Municipal Corporations to give evidence before this Committee on behalf of that Association. I have had experience of the working of the Standing Orders and of the model clause in Hull.

1842. I believe you have actually carried out one scheme under the Act?—Yes, and we have permission to carry out a second.

1843. What has your experience been of the working of this Standing Order; has it been favourable or otherwise?—It has not been favourable at all.

Chairman—continued.

1844. Will you explain to us why?—One of the difficulties we have met with is that the Standing Orders and the model clause impose a positive obligation to erect new buildings. The Local Government Board hold, and I think they are right, that they have no power to release us from that obligation whether houses are wanted or not. I believe that the Home Office do, as a fact, dispense with it in London, but the Local Government Board decline to do so—they insist upon some rebuilding, as I say, whether the locality requires it or not.

1845. Of course, your experience is solely with the Local Government Board?—Solely with the Local Government Board. I may say that in our first scheme we felt very strongly that there was sufficient vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood

Chairman—continued.

neighbourhood, and that we ought not to be called upon to erect any dwellings. In that case we asked the Local Government Board to dispense with a scheme altogether, but they held that they had no power; and we then submitted a scheme, which was a formal compliance with the Act, I think for the provision of four dwellings; we showed the Local Government Board that whilst we were taking 121 houses there were 184 vacant within the half-mile limit. However, the Local Government Board thought the houses to which we referred, while they came within the words "vacant accommodation," were not "suitable vacant accommodation"; and we had a long correspondence on the subject. We thought the Act meant that there should be provision available to reinstate these persons, and whilst certainly the vacant houses were not of a very high class, they were quite as good as, and in some cases better than, those we were taking. However, the Board insisted upon our carrying out the scheme, first for two-thirds of the number displaced, then they relaxed it to one-half, and we provided the accommodation. But we think that before we are required to submit a scheme at all, if the question is raised that no scheme is necessary, there should be an inquiry upon that point.

1846. Would you be ready to extend that advantage to railway companies as well as to corporations?—Yes, I think if it is just in one case it is just in the other.

1847. Do you think that railway companies stand entirely on the same footing as corporations?—No, not entirely on the same footing; but if there is sufficient vacant suitable accommodation in the neighbourhood, then I think obviously no new dwellings are required, whether it be a railway company or a local authority that is acting under the clause.

1848. Is that the main recommendation that you have to make?—That is one of the points. Then another point is that we think in carrying out these schemes we should have protection against the exorbitant price we have to pay when we are taking insanitary property for the purpose of an improvement.

1849. But how would you propose to bring a clause dealing with the question of how much you are to pay, within the Standing Order?—I think in all cases where this obligation is imposed a clause might be inserted such as that which was inserted in the London County Council Bills.

1850. What was it?—I have the clause here; and we tried to get it into our Act of last year, but objections were raised by the Local Government Board, and it was struck out; we consented to its being struck out when we were before Lord Morley.

1851. Then you would like us to step in, and by a Standing Order reverse the proceedings of the Local Government Board; that is what is comes to, is it not?—I do not quite think that.

1852. I wish you would point out the distinction?—The Local Government Board raised some objection to the course we proposed, and we pointed out that Parliament had already sanctioned it in the case of the London County

Chairman—continued.

Council, and we dealt with the objections which the Local Government Board raised, which I do not think were very strong, with all deference to the Board, which I am prepared to deal with here if your lordship thinks proper. May I hand in the clause?

1853. Yes, you can hand in the clause, but this is really a matter of detail. *Primâ facie*, I merely put it to you that it rather appears to me at this moment that settling the question of how much a corporation has to pay for property of a certain quality which it takes is rather a matter to be decided by the particular Bill than to be laid down in the Standing Orders of either House of Parliament?—If your lordship thinks it is not relevant, I will not pursue it; I merely want to put it in this way—that the carrying out of a rebuilding scheme as a condition for obtaining permission to carry out, say, a great street improvement, casts, of course, a very onerous burden upon the rates; it increases very largely the cost of the improvement. You have to take it as part of the cost of the improvement, and when you have to take for the purposes of that improvement a quantity (and we have had to take a very large quantity of what I may term slum property), and have to pay a very exorbitant price for it, we think we ought to have the same provisions with regard to price that we should pay, as they have under the Housing of the Working Classes Act. We are really carrying out the same work; we are taking slum property, and we are erecting sanitary property for the working classes. Instead of doing that under the Housing Act we are doing it under the model clause; and, whilst they have provisions such as I referred to, if they act under the Housing Act, we have none.

1854. Perhaps you would kindly read the provisions given to the London County Council. In what year was it?—This is the London County Council's Improvements Act, 1900: "The Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, claim in any notice to treat for the purchase of any lands intended to be taken for the purpose of this Act: That the lands to which the notice refers are, or comprise, any houses, courts, or alleys unfit for human habitation; that the narrowness, closeness, and bad arrangement, or the bad condition of the streets and houses, or groups of houses, upon any such lands or any buildings thereon, prejudicial to or proper conveniences, or any other sanitary defects, or one or more of such causes, renders any such lands or any buildings thereon, prejudicial to the health of the inhabitants either of the buildings on the said lands or the neighbouring buildings" (they may claim that), "and in the event of such claim, then, on the occasion of assessing the amount of compensation payable in respect of such lands, the court or person settling the same shall determine whether such lands fall wholly or in part within any of the descriptions hereinbefore mentioned, and if they shall so decide, then, in assessing the compensation payable under this Act in respect of any such lands, evidence shall be receivable by such court or person to prove—(first) that the rental of any house or premises was enhanced by reason of the same being used for illegal purposes, or being so overcrowded as to be

Chairman—continued.

dangerous or injurious to the health of the inmates; (secondly) that any house or premises are in a state of defective sanitation, or are not in reasonably good repair; or (thirdly) that any buildings or any such lands are unfit and not reasonably capable of being made fit for human habitation; and if such court or person be satisfied by such evidence, then the purchase money and compensation in respect thereof shall be assessed and determined according to the principles indicated in Section 21 of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890." That gives a special basis of compensation.

1855. But you observe that that clause settles nothing; everything is left to the court?—Everything is left to the tribunal.

1856. So that clause does not settle anything; it is not decided by anything in the nature of a Standing Order, which must be of a positive character, containing positive enactments?—That I quite admit.

1857. Have you anything further that you wish to say?—If you please. The next point that I want to mention is that the dwellings to be erected should not be necessarily composed of houses for the working classes. The erection of some shops in connection with them would, I think, operate in this way; it would not only be a convenience to the persons who occupy the dwellings, but the increased rents which we could obtain from the shops would enable us to let the dwellings at much less rents, and so be a direct benefit to the class that we desire to benefit.

1858. But might not that be done under the present Standing Order? The present Standing Order merely enacts that accommodation shall be found for the persons displaced?—I think your Lordship is quite right. It has been done by Act; we got it in our last year's Act.

1859. So long, I apprehend, as sufficient accommodation is provided to accommodate the number which satisfies the Secretary of State, there is nothing to prevent the Corporation proposing to the Secretary of State in their scheme that in addition to the housing accommodation the lower storeys should be used, say, for shops?—If the Act provides for it, as ours does; and the London County Council Acts do as well.

1860. Then there is really nothing to prevent a proposal of that sort being made to the Secretary of State?—No, I think not, with regard to the Standing Orders.

1861. Do you happen to know whether such a proposal has ever been made to the Local Government Board, as it would be in your case?—Yes, we have made one.

1862. Was it refused?—It was granted conditionally; we were allowed to erect two shops, that is to say, to design the buildings, so that two of the corner premises might be shops with dwellings over them.

1863. But were your proposals cut down in regard to providing shops?—I think the point was, that so long as our accommodation provided for a certain number of the persons to be accommodated, we might do that.

1864. You were allowed to build any number of shops you chose?—We only asked for two, I suppose the same rule would apply.

Chairman—continued.

1865. Is there any other further point you would like to mention?—Of course, I need not bring before the Committee any questions of mere administration—the way I mean that the Local Government Board require the model clause to be carried out; that does not fall, I take it, within the reference.

1866. No; as to the way that the Standing Order has actually to be carried into practice, that falls, of course, upon the department, whatever it may be; and if persons are dissatisfied with the way they administered the Act they can apply to the Court?—I think that the model clause might very well give special terms with regard to the period for which the loan should extend. I believe there is a Committee sitting to consider that very question; therefore I do not know whether it is relevant to bring it before this Committee. I think, considering the price we have to pay for the land and the cost of the buildings we erect upon the land, the term that we get for repayment is much too short.

1867. If there is a Committee considering the length of these loans, and so on, I should say decidedly that we had better leave the subject to that Committee?—I rather think the model clause might deal with that. Having regard to the impossibility, I think I may say, of building these houses and letting them at rents which will pay any reasonable interest upon the outlay, I think that the model clause might stipulate that wherever a housing scheme is carried out we should have a term of years beyond that which is now given for repayment of the loans. I may say I have here the figures showing the actual cost of a scheme which we have carried out, and I could hand the figures in.

1868. You might just tell us roughly what they are?—I will tell your Lordship what the result is. The capital cost of the land and the houses was 13,490*l.* The gross rental is as follows: we let tenements containing two rooms and a scullery for 3*s.* 6*d.* a week; with three rooms and a scullery for 4*s.* 9*d.* a week; and with four rooms and a scullery at 5*s.* 6*d.* a week—that is the highest rental we have. That produces a gross rental of 484*l.* I will not give your Lordship the shillings. After taking off rates and management expenses, 211*l.*, that leaves a net rental of 273*l.*

1869. 50 per cent. of your rents go in repairs and management?—Yes, 101*l.* goes in rates; I have all the details here. The net rental which we receive is brought down to 273*l.* We pay interest on the capital cost amounting to 472*l.* In other words, the dwellings bring in scarcely 2 per cent., and we pay 3½ per cent. for our money, leaving a loss upon the rates of 199*l.* 2*s.* 10*d.* If we add a sinking fund, which perhaps is not fair to add because it is a repayment of the principal, but if we add the sinking fund it amounts to 162*l.* a year, which brings the total addition to the rates up to 361*l.* a year, but without the sinking fund to practically 200*l.* a year—199*l.* 2*s.* 10*d.*

1870. Then by what means should you propose to establish an equilibrium between rent and outlay?—I do not think that we can build

hou

Chairman—continued.

houses and let them at a figure which will bring us in a fair return upon the money.

1871. You mean any return equivalent to what you pay?—May I say that in this case we provided the accommodation within half a mile, and we had to take land which was valuable. In our second scheme we have asked the Local Government Board and the Local Government Board have assented to our going out a mile and a quarter nearly. There we get land instead of at 2*l.* per square yard, at 8*s.* 6*d.* per square yard; and we have a very excellent service of trams running from 5 o'clock in the morning until midnight at 1*d.* fare all the distance; so that the workmen will be able to get out.

1872. Then do you see your way in that case to establish an equilibrium between income and expenditure?—We hope to do so there by the lower cost of the land; and in that case we are building self-contained cottages with a garden, whereas, in the cases I alluded to, we built three blocks of property containing tenements, so many tenements in each block, because we should want such a large quantity of land there if we built separate tenements.

1873. When you say you are building cottages in the outside area, do you mean that you are letting those cottages separately to workmen as workmen's houses?—Yes, each is a separate dwelling with its own garden.

1874. And at what rent—such a rent as a workman can pay?—Yes, some will contain three rooms, some four, and some five, and we do not propose to charge more than 5*s.* 6*d.*, or 5*s.* probably, for the largest of them. I think we shall be able to let at that, and not make a loss. We do not want, of course, to do more than that.

1875. Is there any other point you would like to mention?—There is just one point I should like to mention, that was mentioned by the Lord Provost of Glasgow, and that is, that we feel that in the case of a local authority the obligation might very well be dispensed with altogether; the obligation, that is to say, to submit a scheme to the Local Government Board, and to rebuild in the case of carrying out improvements. We have powers under the Housing Act to provide workmen's dwellings. We are not like a trading company, seeking to obtain a profit; we have put upon us the obligation to rehouse those who are living at present in insanitary houses; and that being so, we think there is no necessity whatever to place this obligation upon us at all.

1876. Then you would think, I apprehend, that you ought to be free, if you choose, when you pull down buildings for sanitary purposes for carrying out an improvement, from any obligation to provide any house accommodation elsewhere?—Yes. We could, if we thought it desirable, frame a scheme under the Housing of the Working Classes Act for the particular class of dwellings that we are alluding to, and reconstruct under that scheme.

1877. Then you would not leave yourselves free in that case?—That is the general law, of course.

1878. I gather now that you would compel yourselves to build houses under the Housing of the Working Classes Act?—We should take advantage of the general law, and we should act under it.

Chairman—continued.

1879. And you would be willing to be taken as bound to do so?—Really, we are bound to do so in the case of insanitary property. I am speaking now, of course, of taking property of the more insanitary class.

1880. But supposing you were taking property such as is taken generally under private Acts put forward by promoters, should you be willing to come under a similar obligation to that which you would come under with regard to slum property?—No, I think not. I may say, so far as regards Hull—I speak of Hull from personal knowledge and experience, and I think, perhaps, the same would apply to other large towns, but certainly not to London—that there is a very large amount of working-class accommodation provided by private enterprise. We have in Hull some 56,000 tenements altogether, houses of which 40,000 are working class dwellings—that is to say, they are dwellings which are let at less than 6*s.* per week, and there is a very large provision always made. We have a large number now of uninhabited houses, and very often to build others is simply to add to the number of those that are unlet.

1881. Is there anything else that you would like to add to your evidence?—No; I think not.

Mr. *Bond.*

1882. I understand that your Corporation have carried out two schemes; you have been concerned in carrying out two schemes?—We have carried out one, and are carrying out a second.

1883. In both those cases could you have said that there was in your view already existing sufficient vacant accommodation to provide for the people who were turned out?—Yes, I think we could.

1884. Then, in fact, the providing of any further accommodation was superfluous?—Yes.

1885. And in the first place the cost was very considerable?—It was.

1886. And the loss consequent upon the building remains a permanent charge upon the rates?—Yes.

1887. What was the character of the buildings that you put up, then, in the first instance?—Three blocks of property, containing tenements—some of them two-roomed tenements, some three rooms, and some four rooms.

1888. Did that accommodation go off readily; were people glad to take it?—Yes, it went off readily, because, I think we let at fairly low rents in order to get them let.

1889. Have you many dwellings of that kind in Hull?—I think I may say none, except those we have erected ourselves.

1890. The fact that it was a new departure did not prevent people from going into them?—No, it did not.

1891. The relation of your rents to your actual outlay seems rather astonishing. Might I ask why the rents are fixed at the rate they are—at a rate which was obviously unremunerative?—We felt that if we fixed high rates we should not be able to let the property.

1892. Does that represent what I may call the current rate in Hull for accommodation of this kind?—Yes, it does; it is quite as much as the current rate.

Mr. *Bond*—continued.

1893. That seems to make it almost impossible to provide fresh accommodation for the working classes in Hull at rents which would be remunerative to the undertakers whether it was a corporation or private parties?—Yes, when we have to obtain the land in the centre of the town, as we had in this case.

1894. What was the relation of the price of the land to the price of the buildings?—The cost of the land was 3,740*l.*, and the buildings 9,750*l.*

1895. Supposing that nothing had been done, and you had been let off this obligation, do you think that the condition of the houses of the working classes in Hull would have suffered materially?—Not at all. I may say that we have not rehoused one of the persons who were displaced.

1896. The people who came into your new buildings were totally different people from the people you displaced?—Yes.

1897. Have you anything to say as to what became of the people that went away?—They were absorbed into a large number of vacant houses which existed.

1898. Were the rents that you were charging for new buildings in excess of the rents which were paid in the cottages which were pulled down?—Yes, I should think they would be in excess of those. Many of those that we pulled down were very old and dilapidated, and would be let at low rents.

1899. Then so far as Hull and similar towns are concerned you think it would be no great hardship if the Standing Order did not exist?—That is my opinion, certainly.

Earl of *Aberdeen.*

1900. In regard to this transaction about which you have shown us this interesting statement, do you consider on the whole that the Corporation had as good an opportunity of carrying out the transaction as any other company of a different kind?—I think so.

Earl of *Aberdeen*—continued.

1901. Therefore we may assume that if it had been a railway company or some other similar company they could not have done better, and might have done worse?—I think they could not have done better.

1902. So that there would have been a loss on the transaction probably in their case?—Yes.

Chairman.

1903. Is not the condition of Hull rather peculiar with regard to the large amount that appears to exist of vacant labouring class accommodation?—Perhaps it may be; that is to say, in the first place a very large proportion of the houses are workmen's dwellings; and, secondly, ever since I have known Hull, and I have known it many years, the supply of houses has always been in excess of the demand.

1904. To what do you attribute that very large excess of supply as there appears to be?—I attribute it to this: We have a good many land speculators who purchase the land in the suburbs just in the outskirts, and they then get hold of small builders and finance them. For the purpose of getting their land off they finance the builder, and the builder erects his buildings, and things are carried out in that way.

Mr. *Bond.*

1905. Have you any particulars about other towns in regard to this matter?—I have not.

1906. You do not know anything about Nottingham, for example?—I do not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered: That this Committee be adjourned.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix A.

PAGE

Paper handed in by Mr. Noel T. Kershaw, 28th May 1902 - - - - - - 129

Appendix B.

Paper handed in by Mr. Noel T. Kershaw, 28th May 1902 - - - - - - 130

Appendix C.

Paper handed in by Mr. W. P. Byrne, 28th May 1902 - - - - - - 131

Appendix D.

Paper handed in by Mr. W. P. Byrne, 28th May 1902 - - - - - - - 133

Appendix E.

Paper handed in by Mr. Noel T. Kershaw, 28th May 1902 - - - - - - 134

Appendix F.

Paper handed in by Mr. J. J. Taylor - - - - - - - - - - - - 140

Appendix G.

Paper handed in by Mr. Colin Scott Moncrieff - - - - - - - - - 141

Appendix H.

Paper handed in by Mr. W. P. Byrne - - - - - - - - - 142

Appendix I.

Paper handed in by the Chairman - - - - - - - - - 148

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Noel T. Kershaw*, 28th May 1902.

THE LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (ADDITIONAL POWERS) ACT, 1899.

MANCHESTER.

SCHEME FOR NEW DWELLINGS FOR PERSONS OF THE LABOURING CLASS.

Whereas under the provisions of the London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) Act, 1899, the London and North Western Railway Company propose to purchase or acquire in the City of Manchester ten or more houses, which, after the passing of the said Act, have been, or on the 15th day of December 1898, were occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring class as tenants or lodgers:

And whereas the said railway company have, in pursuance of Section 31 of the said Act, submitted for the approval of the Local Government Board a scheme for providing new dwellings for such number of persons as were residing in such houses on the 15th day of December 1898, or for such number of persons as the Local Government Board shall, after inquiry, deem necessary, having regard to the number of persons on or after that date residing in such houses and working within one mile therefrom, and to the amount of vacant suitable accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood of such houses, or to the place of employment of such persons, and to all the circumstances of the case:

Now therefore we, the Local Government Board, have deemed it necessary that a local inquiry shall be held by one of our inspectors in relation to the said scheme, and for giving effect to the provisions of the said section, and we have accordingly directed Colonel C. H. Luard, R.E., to hold the said inquiry at the Town Hall, Manchester, on Tuesday, the 23rd day of April 1901, at six o'clock in the evening.

And we hereby give notice that any persons interested in the matter of the said inquiry may attend and give evidence before the inspector at the time and place aforesaid.

Local Government Board,
9 April 1901.

S. B. Provis,
Secretary.

APPENDIX B.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Noel T. Kershaw*, 28th May 1902.

In the matter of the
and
In the matter of a scheme proposed by the in pursuance of Section 4 of the said Act for providing new dwellings for a certain number of persons of the labouring class in the.

WHEREAS under the powers of the (hereinafter called "the Council") require to purchase or acquire ten or more houses occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring class.

Now, therefore, the propose for the approval of the Local Government Board under Section of the said Act, the scheme hereinafter set forth.

For the purpose of providing new dwellings for a certain number of persons of the labouring class, having regard to the number of such persons who were on the fifteenth day of December, one thousand or subsequently, have been resident in dwellings which have been or will be purchased or acquired by the , and which dwellings are specified in the Schedule hereto.

(1.) The shall erect on the site shown on the plan attached hereto and thereon coloured red* separate dwellings.

*A plan marked and coloured accordingly should be prepared in duplicate.

(2.) The accommodation which each of the said dwellings shall afford shall, as regards its nature and extent, be as follows:—

On the ground floor a living room not less than feet inches long, feet inches wide, and feet high, a scullery not less than feet six inches long, feet inches wide, and feet high, a water closet, a fuel store, and a larder so constructed and placed as to admit of the interior being at all times kept cool and well ventilated; and

On the first floor bedrooms, of which the first shall be not less than feet inches long, feet inches wide, and feet high, the second not less than feet inches long feet inches wide, and feet high, &c.

(3.) The shall in and about the erection of the said dwellings comply with the requirements of all public and local Acts, and of any bye-laws and regulations duly made by the local authority and in force in the said urban district.

(4.) The shall carry out the scheme within twelve calendar months of its approval by the Local Government Board, as signified thereon, and the new dwellings to be provided under this scheme shall be completed fit for occupation before the persons residing in the houses in respect of which the scheme is made are displaced.

In Witness whereof the have hereunto caused their Common Seal to be affixed this day of 190 .

The Common Seal of the was hereunto affixed in pursuance of an Order of the Council in the presence of

Approved by the Local Government Board, this day of 190 .

Assistant Secretary.

Acting on behalf of the Local Government Board under the authority of their General Order dated the 26th day of Ma 1877.

APPENDIX C.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *W. P. Byrne*, 28th May 1902.

CASE of the LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

As legal proceedings are pending, I am instructed to confine the account of the proceedings relating to the clearances in the neighbourhood of Park Village East effected by the London and North Western Railway mainly under powers conferred by the London and North Western Railway Act, 1898 (61 and 62 Vict. cap. ccxxiv.) to the following brief summary:—

When the Company's Bill of 1898 was before Parliament the Secretary of State reported against a proposal to give him power to dispense altogether with the requirement to re-house, and it was struck out of the Bill.

Inquiries were made of the Company in July 1899 as to the scope of their operations under the Act, when they said that a scheme would soon be submitted; but as from a general visit of inspection made by the Secretary of State's adviser in October it appeared that some houses had already been acquired, the Company were warned that their operations might render them liable to penalties.

The Company admitted the acquisition of certain property, but pleaded that they "had been compelled to purchase it under an agreement forced upon them by the Crown before they would allow the Bill to proceed;" they promised not to proceed with displacements, but were informed that there was no case for an extension of time and warned that they would be held responsible for any infringement of the Act. They were also asked for definite information as to how many houses they had acquired, and how many houses which they had acquired or were treated for had recently been vacated. This was on the 30th November 1899. Meanwhile the Secretary of State's adviser was directed to keep watch on their proceedings, and repeated reminders were addressed to them (letters dated 19th February 1900, and 12th March 1900). They produced nothing more than a further promise (23rd March 1900) of an early statement, which provoked a peremptory demand (24th March) for some definite information as to the actual operations of the Company.

On the 26th March Mr. Graham, M.P., asked a question in the House.

More definite information as to the number of houses affected (but not of their exact situation) was given by a representative of the Company at an interview with Mr. Cunynghame, the Legal Assistant Under Secretary of State for the Home Department; but it appeared that, in calculating the number of artisan occupants, only houses occupied by persons working within a mile had been included. On the 26th March, therefore, a letter containing the following passages was addressed to the Company:—

> "I am directed by the Secretary of State to express the regret with which he learns that the provisions of this Act have been broken by the acquisition of 32 or more houses occupied by persons of the labouring class without a scheme of re-housing having been submitted to and approved by him.
>
> "I am to say that the Secretary of State has under his consideration the question of taking steps to recover penalties for which the Company have thus made themselves liable; and a further communication on this point will be addressed to you.
>
> "I have further to point out to you that the acquisition under the powers of the Act of sites covered by houses occupied by the working classes, with the stipulation that vacant possession shall be given to the Company, is in Sir Matthew Ridley's opinion an evasion of the Act, and such houses must be regarded as having been acquired within the meaning of the section providing for rehousing; and, secondly, the provision to be made by the Company must be for such number of persons as the Secretary of State shall decide, and not merely for those persons displaced who at the time are working within one mile of their residence.
>
> "I am to say that whatever decision be come to with regard to the question of taking proceedings it is absolutely necessary that the Company should at once submit for his approval a scheme for providing accommodation for all those who will be displaced by their operations under the Act, and I am to request that immediate attention be given to this matter.
>
> "The Secretary of State feels bound to express his serious regret that no replies should have been received till now to the repeated letters which have been addressed to the Company; and I am to say that it will be impossible for him not to consider this delay and evasion when deciding upon the question of taking proceedings."

A reply was received, dated the 6th April 1900, saying that a scheme would be submitted within a fortnight, that no more labouring class houses would be acquired, that the acquisition of a re-housing site would be proceeded with, and that the Company had been obliged to purchase the various properties affected.

On the 1st of June the Secretary of State received his adviser's detailed report on the Company's proposals, which shewed that they contemplated providing accommodation only in respect of certain houses which had been specially coloured on the plans (which by the Standing Orders they had been required to deposit at the Home Office prior to the introduction of their Bill).

A protracted correspondence ensued with regard to the liability of the Company in respect of various classes of the houses affected by their operations, and the total number of the persons for whom they should be called upon to provide new dwellings. In the course of this correspondence the Company repudiated the claim of the Secretary of State to fix a scale of rentals for the new buildings.

No formal scheme has been approved, but the Company have proceeded with the erection of the new dwellings in accordance with plans to which the Secretary of State gave a guarded approval "without prejudice."

The matter was placed in the hands of the Treasury Solicitor in November 1900.

The legal proceedings taken will decide the question of the liability of the Company for their default in not obtaining approval of and executing a re-housing scheme before acquiring 20 or more houses, and, possibly, also the question of the power of the Secretary of State to fix rents.

The total re-housing liability of the Company may be taken roughly at 400 persons.

Dwellings have been erected by them at Mornington Road and Cardington Street suitable for the accommodation of a slightly larger number of persons.

APPENDIX D.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *W. P. Byrne*, 28th May 1902. (*See* Question 312.)

THE only Schemes approved by the Secretary of State, up to August 1901, for numbers of persons lower than 200, were:—

i. Great Peter Street, Westminster, Improvement, under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, 1875; 179 persons displaced in 1879, and at least the same number provided for.

ii. An informal scheme for re-housing in Tower Bridge Buildings persons displaced by the Corporation of the City of London under their Tower Bridge Acts, 1885 and 1889.

About 250 persons displaced in Horselydown between 1891 and 1893; about 150 persons provided for, there being considerable vacant accommodation.

iii. Scheme for re-housing at Grove-lane, Hackney, persons displaced by the Great Eastern Railway (Act of 1890). Persons displaced, 382; as there was ample vacant accommodation of a suitable character in the neighbourhood, the Secretary of State reduced the number of persons to be provided for to 56.

APPENDIX E.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Noel T. Kershaw,* 28th May 1902.

STATEMENT of RE-HOUSING SCHEMES approved by the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD under LOCAL AUTHORITIES and COMPANIES ACTS.

Year.	Place.	Authority or Company.	Number of Houses		Number of Persons of Working Classes		Remarks.
			Taken.	Provided.	Displaced.	Re-housed.	
1886	Liverpool -	Town Council - -	17	50 tenements.	109	—	117 vacant houses within ¼-mile. Town Council contended that no scheme was consequently necessary. Board pointed out that provisions of Act were obligatory, and scheme as then suggested by the Town Council was accepted. Houses were to be erected under Housing of Working Classes Act, 1885.
1888	Leeds - -	Great Northern Railway Company.	16	16	26	40	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Bradford - -	- ditto - - - -	*15	12	27	48	*Included two vacant. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Halifax - -	Halifax High Level, &c., Railway Company.	*16	8	68	32	*Only eight houses to be demolished, Company submitted draft scheme providing for 16 dwellings, but asked Board to accept eight only, having regard to number to be demolished, and suggested that no scheme was necessary on account of building going on. Board accepted eight with condition that more should be provided if any other houses where disturbed. (*See* also particulars as to scheme of 1890).
	Nottingham -	Nottingham Suburban Railway Company.	*29	6	101	30	*Included 10 vacant. 200 vacant houses within ½-mile radius.
1889	West Ham -	Great Eastern Railway Company.	27	60 tenements.	261	300	Accommodation to be provided that originally suggested by Company who, at inquiry, represented that no scheme was necessary on account of vacant accommodation and, in this statement, the Town Council concurred.
	Rochester -	South Eastern Railway Company.	44	41	196	246	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	West Ham -	Town Council - -	36	Nil	163	Nil	Scheme dispensed with by Board under provisions of Local Act. About 130 vacant houses within ½-mile radius.
1890	Halifax - -	Halifax High Level, &c. Railway Company.	4	4	17	16	This scheme was necessitated by the Railway Company demolishing four houses more than they had intended in 1888. The Company proposed four dwellings but suggested at the inquiry that none were necessary. Board however approved scheme as originally submitted.
	Castleford -	North Eastern Railway Company.	26	26	156	156	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Newcastle-on-Tyne.	- - ditto - - -	22	31	179	185	- - ditto.
1891	Fellling - -	- - ditto - - -	59	34 houses containing 68 flats.	300	328	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted. Plans originally provided for two-room tenements. Scheme altered at Board's instance so as to include some three-room tenements.
	Dukinfield -	London and North Western Railway Company.	92	Nil	100	Nil	Scheme dispensed with under Railway Company's Act. 300 vacant houses within ½-mile. Houses to be taken were mostly very dilapidated and were voluntarily vatcaed before notices had been served by the Company.
	Ecclesfield -	Midland Railway Company.	25	25	112	125	No vacant houses. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.

STATEMENT of Re-housing Schemes approved by the Local Government Board, &c.—*continued.*

Year.	Place.	Authority or Company.	Number of Houses		Number of Persons of Working Classes		Remarks.
			Taken.	Provided.	Displaced.	Re-housed.	
1891	Tottenham -	Tottenham and Forest Gate Railway Company.	12	6	86	36	40 houses vacant within ½-mile. Company contended that no scheme was necessary, but afterwards submitted scheme as accepted by Board.
1892	Walthamstow -	- - ditto - ditto -	65	20	96	100	8 houses not to be demolished. 78 houses and 17 tenements vacant in neighbourhood. Company proposed 10 houses, having regard to number of occupants working within one mile. Board required 20 houses, taking into consideration those workmen who had to come up to London each day.
	Leyton and Wanstead.	- - ditto - ditto -	69	30	120	150	50 vacant houses in the neighbourhood. Accommodation suggested by Company accepted.
	West Ham -	- - ditto - ditto -	33	14	71	71	Company proposed to erect 11 houses. Board required 14.
	Manchester -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	*34	6 flats.	130	24	101 vacant houses within ½-mile. *Included 10 not to be demolished.
	Salford - -	- - ditto - ditto -	202	85	*985	500	273 vacant houses in neighbourhood. *Included families of men working over one mile away from their dwellings, and numbering 479 persons. Company proposed to provide for 126 persons, but Board required provision for 500.
	Manchester -	Town Council - -	211	Blocks of model dwellings.	*829	*829	*The schemes and displacements of the Town Council were "pooled." This was the number in respect of the improvement under consideration.
	Leicester -	Midland Railway Company.	23	20	86	100	Town Council contended that new dwellings were not required. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Leeds - -	North Eastern Railway Company.	167	185	763	763	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Ecclesfield -	Midland Railway Company.	14	15	68	75	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Manchester -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	93	Building containing 40 dwellings.	387	144	Over 200 vacant houses within ½-mile. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
1893	Sheffield - -	Town Council - -	23	23	92	92	A number of vacant houses in neighbourhood. Town Council did not propose to build, but, upon objection by Board, submitted scheme for accommodating all the persons displaced.
	Waltham Holy Cross.	Local Board - - -	15	12	71	72	Accommodation proposed by Local Board accepted.
1893	Bradford - -	Town Council - -	109	4	690	24	Houses to be taken were scattered in small groups over the borough. 1,050 vacant houses. Case regarded as very exceptional.
	Croydon - -	Town Council - -	*34	10 cottages, 1 lodging house.	443	150	*Included private lodging houses. Vacant accommodation for 365 persons within a mile. Of persons displaced, 372 were temporary occupants (casual labourers, hawkers, flower sellers, &c.)
	Linthwaite -	Local Board - - -	13	4	57	20	36 vacant houses in neighbourhood. Board at first required seven houses, but subsequently reduced number to four.
	Ashton-under-Lyne.	Town Council - -	34	12	131	72	Large number of vacant houses in district. Board refused to accept provision of three houses as sufficient.
	Salford - -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	177	74	849	370	223 vacant houses in neighbourhood. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Croydon - -	London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company.	15	6	79	30	Company required to demolish five houses containing 24 persons, and to take the gardens of the others. Scheme for provision of six houses accepted on understanding that, if company were compelled by owners of the other houses to purchase them, such houses should remain as dwellings for working classes.

STATEMENT of Re-housing Schemes approved by the Local Government Board, &c.—*continued.*

Year.	Place.	Authority or Company.	Number of Houses		Number of Persons of Working Classes		Remarks.
			Taken.	Provided.	Displaced.	Re-housed.	
1893	Oxford - -	Town Council - -	20	2	—	12	Ample vacant accommodation in neighbourhood.
1894	Wrexham -	Wrexham and Ellesmere Railway Company.	*111	50	*474	225	*Included 42 houses containing 209 persons not to be disturbed. Company proposed to provide 36 houses, including 13 in course of erection. Board required 50 houses to be erected.
	Newbold and Dunston.	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln Railway Company.	17	2	83	12	None of the houses to be disturbed. Company to submit further scheme if any should hereafter be demolished.
	Gorton - -	- - ditto - ditto -	17	8	62	32	Houses had already been demolished. 47 vacant houses in neighbourhood. Company at first proposed 17, but at inquiry asked that number might be reduced to three. Board accepted three, in view of vacant accommodation and buildings in course of erection.
	Chesterfield -	- - ditto - ditto -	*25	10	51 (in 10 houses).	40	*15 not to be demolished.
	Kingston, Surrey.	Town Council - -	20	12	*175	72	*This included 67 vagrants disregarded by Board in fixing accommodation in neighbourhood.
1894	Briton Ferry -	Rhondda and Swansea Bay Railway Company.	*46	12	205	60	*Only 13 houses accommodating 52 persons to be demolished. Railway Company proposed three new houses. Board required 12, with condition that, if the houses to be retained become untenable (from vibration or other causes), further scheme should be submitted.
1895	Newcastle-on-Tyne.	North Eastern Railway Company.	82	80	404	498	Accommodation to be provided was that suggested by Company, who afterwards proposed to reduce number of houses, but board required the full number.
	Nottingham -	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln Railway Company.	211	100	717	600	Borough said to be very much over-built; over 100 vacant houses within half-mile. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Leicester -	- ditto - ditto -	218	200	925	1,200	Large number of vacant houses in neighbourhood.
	Heckmondwike	London and North Western Railway Company.	126	80	491	480	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Loughborough	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln Railway Company.	43	26	200	130	99 vacant cottages within quarter-mile radius. Borough over-built.
	Keighley -	Town Council - -	46	24	64	96	50 vacant houses and 32 in course of erection. The Town Council were taking 65 houses, containing about 260 persons. The figures given represent the houses to be demolished and persons of the working class actually displaced.
	Middlesbrough	- ditto - - -	*30	5	100	30	*17 of these were unoccupied at time of scheme; 163 vacant houses within one mile. Town Council proposed to erect three houses; board asked for 10, but finally accepted five.
	Chesterfield -	Lancashire, Derby, and East Coast Railway Company.	*46	49	271	245	*Included lodging-houses. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Bolton - -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	18	12	78	60	24 vacant houses within half-mile radius.
1896	Leicester -	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln Railway Company.	208	100	829	500	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted, having regard to excess accommodation provided in previous scheme.
	Dover - -	Town Council - -	70	23	238	138	Most of the houses to be taken were vacant, and there was also a large number of empty houses within the borough.
	Manchester -	- ditto - - -	103	60	701	*300	*This number was fixed after making allowance for excess accommodation provided in respect of earlier schemes.
	Rainford -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	18	18	55	55	Accommodation fixed by agreement between the Railway Company and a Colliery Company owning the houses to be demolished.
	Mirfield - -	London and North Western Railway Company.	*21	12	93	72	*Included eight empty houses.

STATEMENT of Re-housing Schemes approved by the Local Government Board, &c.—*continued.*

Year.	Place.	Authority or Company.	Number of Houses		Number of Persons of Working Classes		Remarks.
			Taken.	Provided.	Displaced.	Re-housed.	
1897	Nottingham -	Great Northern Railway Company.	*24	15	113	90	*Included two not be demolished.
	Manchester -	- - ditto - - -	*131	99	*935	495	*Included common lodging-houses, containing 415 persons. Company suggested 60 houses. Town Council thought this insufficient. Board required 99.
	Manchester -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	180	75	757	525	124 vacant houses in neighbourhood.
	Birkenhead -	London and North Western and Great Western Railway Companies.	27	25	165	150	Accommodation proposed by Companies accepted.
	Nottingham -	Manchester, Sheffield and Lincoln Railway Company.	*525	200	1,528	1,200	*Only 399 houses occupied by the working classes were to be demolished. Houses to be provided were larger than those taken. Borough overbullt, bnt temporary demand for ihonses on account of extensive railway works. Company suggested 150 dwellings, Board required 200.
	Preston - -	Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North Western Railway Companies.	31	16	122	96	49 vacant houses quite close, 121 within ½-mile radius.
1898	Waltham Holy Cross.	Urban District Council	*15	10	65	60	*Included four vacant houses. Accommodation proposed by District Council accepted.
	Sheffield - -	London and North Western Railway Company.	79	55	356	275	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Ardsley - -	Midland Railway Company.	27	22	87	100	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Leigh - -	Urban District Council	24	14	105	70	District Council proposed 10 houses on the ground that half the inhabitants of those to be demolished had already declined to take the new houses when erected. Board required 14.
	Manchester -	Town Council - -	22	22	111	110	Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
	Llanwrthwl and Llansaintffraid Cumdenddwr.	Birmingham Town Council.	*31	6	25 (in houses to be demolished.)	36	*Included 17 not to be demolished. Houses to be taken inhabited chiefly by shepherds and small farmers. The submersion of a large area of land in the vicinity by the formation of a reservoir reduced the amount of employment, and consequently the need for houses in the locality.
	Nottingham -	Town Council - -	279	100	1,152	600	Borough much overbuilt.
1899	Kingston-on-Hull.	North Eastern Railway Company.	30	17	153	102	Large number of vacant houses. After contending that scheme was unnecessary, Company proposed to erect 12 houses. Board required 17.
	New Mills -	Midland Railway Company.	25	20	108	104	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Basingstoke -	London and South Western Railway Company.	14	14	58	84	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Carlisle - -	Town Council - -	31	40	145	130	Town Council originally proposed three blocks of 20 tenements each, but afterwards reduced this number to one block on the ground that the others were not required. Board, however, required the erection of a second block of tenements.
	Bolton - -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	58	26	213	156	52 vacant houses within half-mile radius.
	Blackpool -	Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North Western Railway Company.	29	14	120	84	Nine vacant houses, and 31 in course of erection in the vicinity.
	Manchester - -	Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	187	120	899	600	89 vacant houses within three-quarter mile radius. Company proposed to provide for 480 persons, but Board required provision for 600.
	West Ham -	Great Eastern Railway Company	44	40	227	200	66 vacant houses within one mile radius. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.

STATEMENT of Re-housing Schemes approved by the Local Government Board, &c.—*continued.*

Year.	Place.	Authority or Company.	Number of Houses		Number of Persons of Working Classes		Remarks.
			Taken.	Provided.	Displaced.	Re-housed.	
1899	Shrewsbury	Great Western and London and North Western Railway Companies.	22	8	65	48	Large number of vacant houses. Companies proposed to erect two houses, but Board required eight as some of vacant houses were not satisfactory as regards sanitary arrangements and state of repair.
	Bath	Town Council	17	40	54	176	Accommodation to be provided that proposed by Town Council after being told that some scheme was compulsory.
	Newcastle-on-Tyne.	North Eastern Railway Company.	44	44	319	283	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Plymouth	Town Council	18	36 tenements.	105	116	Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
	Bristol	- ditto	116	70	380	298	598 vacant houses in neighbourhood. Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
1900	Sutton Coldfield and Curdworth.	Birmingham, Tame and Rea Drainage Board.	*43	15	*202	87	* 23 houses not to be demolished; only 86 persons to be displaced. Accommodation proposed by Joint Board accepted.
	Portsmouth	London, Brighton and South Coast, and London and South Western Railway Companies.	22	2 blocks, 32 tenements.	94	96	Accommodation proposed by Companies accepted.
	Great Yarmouth.	Town Council	11	12	35	48	Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
	Kingston-on-Hull.	- ditto	144	40	427	200	53 suitable vacant houses in neighbourhood. Town Council only proposed to re-house 20 persons.
	Manchester	Town Council	41	40	168	240	Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
	Middlesbrough	- ditto	15	12	92	60	About 80 suitable vacant houses within one mile radius. Town Council proposed to provide five, but Board insisted on 12.
	Southampton	Southampton Gas Company.	21	18	75	102	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
1901	Colne	Midland and Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.	11	7	48	42	Accommodation proposed by companies accepted. About 94 vacant houses within half-mile radius.
	Sheffield	Midland Railway Company.	19	11	*55	59	*Included 26 working at a distance of one mile or more from their dwellings. Only 15 of the houses to be taken were occupied by the working classes. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Ilkeston	Town Council	*16	4	62	24	*Four were empty. Ample vacant accommodation in neighbourhood. Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
	South Shields	- ditto	*25	32 tenements	212	160	*Included lodging-houses. Ample vacant accommodation in neighbourhood.
	Brighton	London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company.	172	125	955	922	No vacant accommodation. Company willing to provide such accommodation as Board might deem necessary. Board required accommodation for practically whole number of those displaced.
	Barry	Urban District Council	*20	2	95	10	*Only four occupied at time of scheme; 249 vacant houses within ¼-mile and 925 within ½-mile.
	Manchester	London and North Western Railway Company.	127	80	527	480	400 houses being built within ½ mile; also number of vacant houses. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Ditto	- ditto - ditto	198	129	836	774	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Bradford	Town Council	15	2	58	8	Scheme proposed by Town Council accepted on account of large number of vacant houses in district.
	Ashbourne	London and North Western Railway Company.	13	7	52	35	Large number of houses would be vacated shortly by men employed on the railway works. Company at first proposed nine houses, but later on, asked Board to dispense with scheme, or at least to reduce number. Board agreed to accept seven.
	Bootle	Town Council	24	6	122	24	107 vacant houses in neighbourhood. Town Council at first proposed 18 houses, but subsequently reduced this number to six on account of vacant accommodation.

STATEMENT of Re-housing Schemes approved by the Local Government Board, &c.—*continued.*

Year.	Place.	Authority or Company.	Number of Houses		Number of Persons of Working Classes		Remarks.
			Taken.	Provided.	Displaced.	Re-housed.	
1901	West Ham -	Town Council - -	73	48 tenements	325	240	Town Council at first proposed 36 double-tenement houses, but afterwards wished to reduce this number to 12. Board consented to accept 24.
	Morley - -	- ditto - - -	11	11	53	44	Accommodation to be provided that proposed by Town Council after Board had pointed out necessity for scheme.
	Salford - -	Manchester Ship Canal Company.	23	10	77	60	Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
1902	Blackpool -	Lancashire and Yorkshire and London and North Western Railway Companies.	19	14	89	84	21 vacant houses within ½-mile radius. Accommodation proposed by companies accepted.
	Manchester -	Town Council - -	59	50	219	250	Houses to be erected under Part III. Housing Working Classes Act, 1890. Accommodation proposed by Town Council accepted.
	Ditto - -	- ditto - - -	72	80	346	400	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Ditto - -	- ditto - - -	18	20	94	100	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Nottingham -	Midland Railway Company.	111	48	541	384	Large number of vacant houses and houses in course of erection. Accommodation proposed by Company accepted.
	Rotherham -	- ditto - ditto -	16	10	78	60	Scheme proposed by Company accepted.
	Hartlepool -	North Eastern Railway Company.	25	25	209	150	- - ditto - - ditto.
	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.	Town Council - -	87	80 tenements	*510	301	*Of these only 375 worked within one mile of their residence. Town Council proposed to re-house 230, but Board required provision to be made for 300 persons.

APPENDIX F.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Dear Sir 3rd June 1902.

IN reply to your letter of to-day, I have to state that the Irish Government do not desire to give evidence before the Select Committee on Housing of the Working Classes, and that the Vice-President of the Local Government Board for Ireland reports that, so far, the Department has not found that the Standing Orders have been productive of any inconvenience or hardship in Ireland, and that he sees no ground, therefore, for urging any alterations upon the Committee.

The operations of the Irish Department under the Act are much less extensive than in England, and if the English Local Government Board, with its extended experience, advocates any changes, the Chief Secretary thinks it would be well to apply them to Ireland also.

Yours truly,

Sir Everard H. Doyle, Bart. *J. J. Taylor.*

APPENDIX G.

Enclosure 1.

My Lord, Scottish Office, Whitehall, S.W., 14 June, 1902.

I HAVE the honour, by direction of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, to refer to your conversation with him on the 2nd instant in which you referred to the appointment of a Joint Committee on the Standing Orders relating to Houses of the Labouring Class, and inquired whether it was desired on behalf of the Scottish Office to make any suggestions as to the way in which these Standing Orders operate. In reply I am to state that there is no special point on which the Secretary for Scotland desires to tender evidence to the Committee; I am, however, to transmit for the information of the Committee a Memorandum of the practice of the Scottish Office in dealing with applications for the exercise of a dispensing power and to add that if thought desirable an official from this Office can attend before the Committee to put in the paper.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Colin Scott Moncrieff.*

The Right Honourable The Earl of Camperdown,
39, Charles-street, Berkeley Square, W.

LABOURING CLASSES DISPLACEMENT CLAUSES IN PRIVATE BILLS AND PROVISIONAL ORDERS.

The history of the "displacement of the labouring classes" Standing Order is as follows:—

The Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes in their Report (c. 4402—1889, page 86) found that previous Standing Orders requiring the insertion of re-housing clauses had not been sufficiently stringent, railway companies habitually evading their obligations.

They accordingly recommended new Standing Orders, which were adopted by both Houses of Parliament and which *are absolute in their requirements.*

See Standing Orders, House of Commons, Nos. 38 and 183a herewith.

The same Commission in their Scotch Report (c. 4409—1885 pp, 6–7) point out that in Scotland there is no strong feeling in favour of compulsory re-housing.

In Scotland cases arising under the Standing Order frequently take the form of application for dispensation from the re-housing requirements—generally on the ground of ample vacant accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood; and when the local inquiry has disclosed the fact, by written and parole evidence, that substantially there is no need for undertakers to provide new dwellings it has been the Scottish Office practice to accept a detailed statement of the number and description of suitable vacant houses as a nominal "scheme."

APPENDIX H.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *W. S. Byrne.*

PARTICULARS of RE-HOUSING SCHEMES submitted to the SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT in pursuance of the requirements of LOCAL ACTS, by (1) LOCAL AUTHORITIES, and (2) PRIVATE COMPANIES.

(1) LOCAL AUTHORITIES.*

Act containing the Re-housing requirement.	Authority concerned.	Name of Improvement, &c.	Number of Working Class Displaced.	Number re-housed or to be re-housed.	Kind of buildings erected.	Other points.
Metropolitan Streets Improvement Act, 1877.	Metropolitan Board of Works.	Shaftesbury Avenue, Charing Cross Road, Coventry Street widening (new streets, &c.)	4,000	3,041	Block dwellings in Grafton Street, Shaftesbury Avenue, and Old Pye Street.	The provisions of the Statute gave rise to great difficulty. *See* the Report of the Select Committee of 1881–1882 and the Act of 1883 relaxing the original requirements. The dwellings required were all erected by December 1884.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Gray's Inn Road and Elm Street (new street).	2,148	1,200 (fixed by the Act of 1882).	Block dwellings on various sites near the improvement.	Similar difficulties arose here. *See* the Report of the Committee and the amending Acts of 1882–1884 and 1887. Buildings all completed.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Kentish Town Road Improvement.	265	310	Block dwellings five storeys high.	Buildings finished, 1886. There was plenty of other vacant accommodation, but it was felt that the terms of the Statute did not permit it to be accepted as sufficient.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Tooley Street Improvement.	860	1,000	Block dwellings - -	Buildings finished in the early eighties.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Marshalsea Road (new street).	1,068	417	- ditto - - -	*See* also ss. 39 & 40 of the Board's Acts of 1884. The affected area was in a shocking condition, and until it was cleared no progress could be made with other neighbouring improvements. As there was much vacant room in the neighbourhood the Secretary of State accepted the diminished amount of re-housing in order to hasten the clearance. Buildings finished, 1888.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Jamaica Road and Union Road, Bermondsey improvements.	104	350	Dwellings at Little Cherry Garden Street and at Jamaica Road.	Sites not sold for building till 1883. Delay partly compensated for by amount of accommodation provided. Buildings to be reserved for artizans for 80 years.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Widening of Camberwell Road, Church Street, and Peckham Road, High Street, and Queen's Road.	38	260	Dwellings at Camberwell	

Metropolitan Board of Works Bridges Acts, 1881 and 1884.	Metropolitan Board of Works and London County Council.	Battersea Bridge - -	190	250 (about).	A block and a cottage in Bridge Road.	The London County Council took over the unfulfilled obligation from the Metropolitan Board of Works. In 1894–5 they contemplated getting Parliamentary sanction for its non-fulfilment (the Secretary of State feeling unable himself to grant a dispensation), but recently they decided to proceed with the works, which are now completed.
Metropolitan Board of Works Various Powers Act, 1882.	Metropolitan Board of Works.	Tooley Street (widening to Dean Street).	102	Nil	Nil	The Bill merely required accommodation to be "procured," and as there were hundreds of vacant tenements near by the Secretary of State did not in this case oppose the Bill.
Metropolitan Street Improvement Act, 1883.	- - ditto - - -	Upper Street, Islington (widening between the "Fox" and Barnsbury Street).	226	145	A five-storey block at Waterloo Terrace.	Vacant room existed in the neighbourhood. (The Bill was like that of 1882, but was amended at the instance of the Secretary of State so as to require the provision of fresh accommodation). Buildings finished, 1887.
Ditto - - - -	- - ditto - - -	Hampstead, High Street widening, and new street from Church Row.	405	246	Five-storey block at Holly Bush Vale.	Much vacant room existed close by. Improvement and clearances not effected before 1885. Buildings finished, 1888.
Ditto - - -	- - ditto - - -	Widening of Green Street, Bethnal Green.	111	134	Four-storey block fronting Green Street.	Buildings finished, 1888.
Metropolitan Board of Works (Various Powers) Act, 1885.	Metropolitan Board of Works, and the London County Council.	Rosebery Avenue (New Street).	2,479	2,082	Blocks of four, six, and seven storeys on six sites mostly adjacent to the improvement.	The Act of 1885 was the first passed under the new Standing Order. In fixing the accommodation to be provided the Secretary of State was to have regard to the number of persons displaced who worked within a mile of their old homes. This was 1,620, and accommodation in respect of these was provided for 1,738 persons. Dwellings to accommodate 344 other persons had been provided at Gray's Inn-road in excess of the statutory requirements, and these were allowed to count towards the Rosebery Avenue scheme. Total 2,082.
Thames Tunnel (Blackwall) Act, 1887.	- - ditto - - -	Blackwall Tunnel - -	565 Poplar - 641 Greenwich	600 Poplar - - 864 Greenwich	Some block dwellings five storeys high and some cottages; seven different sites concerned.	The Secretary of State has experienced much difficulty in securing compliance with the re-housing requirements in this case, which were carried out after after long delay.
			1,206	1,464		
London County Council (General Powers) Act, 1891.	London County Council -	Evelyn Street to Creek Road Improvement, Deptford.	288	Nil.	——	Much vacant room existed in the neighbourhood.
London County Council, Tower Bridge (Southern Approach) Act, 1895.	- - ditto - - -	Tower Bridge, Southern Approach.	545	Nil.	——	- - ditto - - ditto - - ditto.
London County Council (General Powers, Act, 1897.	- - ditto - - -	Widening of Long Lane, Improvement of Approach to Tabard Street.	291	? 400	Block buildings in Leroy Street five storeys high.	The Council have had some difficulty in acquiring a site. It appears probable that satisfactory arrangements will be made for the erection of dwellings at Leroy Street.

* This does not include schemes submitted under the Housing of the Working Classes Acts.

APPENDIX H.—PARTICULARS of Re-housing Schemes submitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of the requirements of Local Acts, &c.—*continued.*

(1.) LOCAL AUTHORITIES*—*continued.*

Act containing the Re-housing requirement.	Authority concerned.	Name of Improvement, &c.	Number of Working Class Displaced.	Number re-housed or to be re-housed.	Kind of buildings erected.	Other points.
London County Council (General Powers) Act, 1898.	London County Council	York Road widening, Battersea and Wandsworth.	218	218	Block dwelling five storeys high.	Plans approved. Scheme to be formally approved as soon as contracts are entered into. The buildings will accommodate 268, but the surplus is earmarked for other purposes.
London County Council (Improvements) Act, 1899.	ditto	New Street, Holborn to Strand.	About 3,700	About 3,700	Maclise Buildings, Millbank, The Reid's site, the Herbrand Street site, lodging-house at Kemble Street.	There have been protracted discussions with the Council as to the numbers that ought to be housed, and the places where they are to accommodated. The buildings at Millbank are finished, but these will only accommodate 290 persons; those at the Reid's Brewery site and at Herbrand-street are not yet finished, and plans have still to be submitted of the Kemble-street Lodging House.
London County Council (Improvements) Act, 1900.	ditto	Widening of Mare Street, Hackney.	?	190	Improved balcony dwellings six storeys high.	Plans provisionally approved. Site near London Fields.
Ditto	ditto	Thames Embankment extension and improvements in Westminster.	Probably 1,864 Maximum possible 2,242	2,152	Block dwellings on site of Millbank Prison.	Scheme approved and new dwellings erected, though the improvement itself has not yet been carried out. The details of the new dwellings were settled at another time as part of a comprehensive scheme for dealing with the property on the Millbank site.
Thames Tunnel (Rotherhithe and Ratcliffe) Act, 1900.	ditto	Rotherhithe and Ratcliffe Tunnel.	Stepney - 1,135 Bermondsey - 1,497 ? 2,632	(1) Swan Lane (2) Albion Street, Bermondsey - 1,497 (3) Site at Ropemaker's Fields (4) London Street, Stepney - 1,153 ? 2,632	—	Scheme now the subject of negotiations. Details not settled. Part of the re-housing sites were taken under the Council's General Powers Act of 1901, and the numbers to be displaced from these sites are included in the numbers to be provided for.
Various Provisional Order Confirmation Acts.	London School Board	Various sites in Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, Camberwell, Bermondsey, Mile End, and Ratcliffe.	About 1,600	1,030	Balcony dwellings, Preston Road, Poplar.	Inquiries in 1899 elicited the fact that the Board's operations had been conducted so as to escape any liability to re-house. An amendment was made in the Board's Act of 1899 to meet this, and the Board have accepted liability for past displacements. There was much discussion as to the numbers to be provided for, but this has been finally settled at 1,030. The Board are paying the London County Council to take over their liability, and this arrangement has been accepted by the Secretary of State.
Corporation of London (Tower Bridge) Acts, 1885 and 1889.	The City Corporation	Tower Bridge	250	150	A block, Tower Bridge Buildings.	Buildings finished.

* This does not include schemes submitted under the Housing of the Working Classes Acts.

APPENDIX H.—PARTICULARS of Re-housing Schemes submitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of the requirements of Local Acts, &c.—*continued.*

(2) PRIVATE COMPANIES.*

Act containing the Re-housing requirement.	Company concerned.	Nature of Clearance.	Number of Working Class Displaced.	Number re-housed or to be re-housed.	Kind of buildings erected.	Other points.
London and Blackwall Railway Act, 1885.	Great Eastern Railway Company and London and Blackwall Railway Company.	Widenings and improvements on the north side of the London and Blackwall Railway.	Maximum 1,063; probably much less.	640	Block dwellings four storeys high, at Thomas Street, Whitechapel.	Buildings finished by May 1891.
Great Eastern Railway Acts, 1885 and 1887.	Great Eastern Railway Company.	Enlargement of Liverpool Street Station.	737	600	Block dwellings, four storeys high, at Quaker Street, Spitalfields; Winchester Street, Bethnal Green; and Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel.	Buildings finished during 1890. There was vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood for those not provided for.
Great Eastern Railway (General Powers) Act, 1890.	- - ditto - - -	Bethnal Green to Hackney Downs widening.	382	56	A block two storeys high at Grove Lane, Hackney.	So much vacant room existed that there was no real necessity for a scheme; it was considered, however, that the Secretary of State could not altogether dispense with re-housing. Buildings finished, 1892.
London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Act, 1890.	London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Company.	Enlargement of Willow Walk Goods Station.	1,738	870	One block five storeys and five blocks four storeys high at Swan Mead.	Some vacant accommodation existed in the neighbourhood. Buildings finished in 1894.
Ditto - - - - -	- - ditto - - -	- - ditto - - -	?224	224	Two blocks four storeys high at Swan Mead.	It appeared in 1897 that the company were making certain clearances not covered by their earlier proposals. They disputed their liability to re-house, but after discussion agreed to submit a scheme. The dwellings were finished by October 1900.
Midland Railway Additional Powers Act, 1890.	Midland Railway Company.	Clearances at St. Pancras	1,376	1,376	Four blocks of four storeys each at Clarendon Square, on the site of the Polygon.	The vacant accommodation in the vicinity was not taken into account, and the company were required to re-house all the persons displaced. The buildings were finished in 1894.
London and South Western Railway Act, 1890.	London and South Western Railway Company.	Clearances in St. Mary, Lambeth (various widenings from Waterloo to Nine Elms).	1,041	1,224	Five blocks five storeys high at Vauxhall Walk.	Buildings finished, 1894.

* Before 1885, when the Standing Orders were made more stringent in consequence of the Report of the Royal Commission of 1885, there had been no instance of the execution of a re-housing scheme by a private company.

APPENDIX H.—PARTICULARS of Re-housing Schemes submitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of the requirements of Local Acts, &c.—*continued.*

(2.) PUBLIC COMPANIES*—*continued.*

Act containing the Re-housing requirement.	Company concerned.	Nature of Clearance.	Number of Working Class Displaced.	Number re-housed or to be re-housed.	Kind of buildings erected.	Other points.
Waterloo and City Railway Act, 1893.	Waterloo and City Railway Company, and London and South Western Railway Company.	Clearances at St. Mary, Lambeth.	? 90	Nil	Nil	The Company contended that there was no liability to re-house. It has since been arranged, however, that accommodation in respect of these clearances shall be provided as part of the great schemes of the London and South Western Railway Company under their Acts of 1898-1899 and 1900, *see* below.
Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln Railway Act, 1893.	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company.	Clearances in Marylebone	4,448	2,690	Six blocks of dwellings of fixe storeys each in St. John's Wood Road.	Some vacant accommodation in the neighbourhood. Buildings finished in 1897.
Surrey Commercial Dock Act, 1894.	Surrey Commercial Dock Company.	Re-housing at Trundleys Road, Whitcher Street, Sanford Street, Knoyle Street, Deptford.	631	649	Two and three storey cottages.	Some persons willing to go were removed temporarily to Alloa Road, Deptford, pending provision of the permanent accommodation: free removal in each case and low rent. Scheme for permanent re-housing signed 24th April 1900, and by May 1901 all houses were finished.
South Eastern Railway Act 1896.	South Eastern Railway Company.	Widenings 1 and 2, Lambeth.	417	440	Two blocks four storeys high at Russell Gardens, Stangate Street, Lambeth: 292 persons re-housed temporarily, during the progress of the work, at Rectory Buildings, Deptford, and Crooks Road, Deptford.	Buildings finished 1898.
Ditto - - - - -	ditto - -	Widening 5, Rotherhithe and Deptford.	1,075	1,080	Seven blocks, three storeys each, at Folkestone Gardens, Trundleys Road, Deptford.	
Whitechapel and Bow Railway Act, 1897.	Whitechapel and Bow Railway Company.	Displacement in Bromley St. Leonard.	281	286	Block dwellings five storeys high.	Company proposed to transfer their liabilities to a dwellings company, but the buildings suggested were not satisfactory, and this was not allowed. Scheme signed 2nd November 1900, buildings completed March 1901.

South Eastern Railway Act, 1897	South Eastern Railway Company.	Widenings 4 and 4A, Horselydown and Bermondsey.	? 720	? 720	Plans approved for re-housing 88 at Tower Bridge, Southern Approach. Some temporarily re-housed at Snows Buildings. Scheme still to come.	Negotiations in progress since 1897. Proposed re-housing site near Tooley Street was rejected by the Secretary of State as unsuitable. Others at Trundleys Road, Hither Green, and Grove Park, near Bromley, Bermondsey Street and Abbey Street have been put forward in succession, and after examination and discussion have either proved unsuitable or have been found to be not available. The company are being urged to submit a satisfactory scheme for permanent re-housing, as their works has required displacements to be carried out.
Ditto	- - ditto - - -	Widening No. 1, Raymouth Road.	? 400	? 400	Scheme for permanent re-housing at Rotherhithe New Road under consideration.	The question of displacing and re-housing these people arose in May 1902. A scheme for temporary re-housing was rejected as unsuitable.
Great Central Railway Act, 1898.	Great Central Railway Company.	Lands to be acquired round North Street, Marylebone.	1,750 (about)	1,600 (about)	Partly dwellings, partly Rowton Houses.	No scheme because the company have not yet acquired the property to be cleared.
London and North Western Railway Act, 1898.	London and North Western Railway Company.	Clearances near Regent's Park.	400	408	Blocks at Mornington Road and Cardington Street.	Legal proceedings are pending against this company. Details of the case have been submitted in a separate statement.
South Eastern Railway Act, 1899.	South Eastern Railway -	25 houses acquired at Ladywell and Catford.	? —	? ——	—	Scheme not yet submitted.
Great Eastern Railway (General Powers) Act, 1900.	Great Eastern Railway Company.	Brady Street, &c., Whitechapel.	720	844	Block dwellings five storeys high.	Plans approved. Scheme about to be submitted. The company proposed to re-house on a site already set aside for artizans dwellings. This was allowed, subject to modifications in the plans submitted, but it was stipulated that the accommodation should be far more than the actual number displaced, so that there should be a substantial addition to the number of artizans dwellings which would in any case have been erected in the locality. The Secretary of State fixed rents at a lower figure than the company wished.
London and South Western Railway Act, 1898, *see* 1900; London and South Western Railway Act, 1899, *see* 1900; London and South Western Railway Acts, 1898, 1899, 1900.	London and South Western Railway Company.	Lambeth widenings, Wandsworth widening, enlargement of Waterloo Station.	About 2,500 Schedules still under discussion.	About 2,650 including those displaced from re housing sites, and by the Waterloo and City Railway. (*See* above).	Block dwellings five storeys high at Boniface Street, at Maudslay Street (on the site of Maudslay's Engineering Works), and at South Lambeth Road near Vauxhall Station.	Boniface Street dwellings finished. Rapid progress being made with the others, many of the blocks being finished. Many minor points as to particular houses being taken, numbers of occupants, &c., still being dealt with.

* Before 1885, when the Standing Orders were made more stringent in consequence of the Report of the Royal Commission of 1885, there had been no instance of the execution of a re-housing scheme by a private company.

APPENDIX I.

PAPER handed in by the *Chairman.*

WE wish to record our dissent from the recommendation that the Central Authority be empowered to fix the rents of the new houses erected in London in place of the houses demolished, under a scheme.

We object, on principle, to a Central Authority fixing rents; but are prepared to agree to rents being thus fixed in the case of persons actually displaced, who desire accommodation in the new dwellings.

(signed) *Camperdown.*
Hatherton.
Jesse Collings.

We desire to place on record our dissent from the recommendation that in London the Home Secretary would have power to fix the rents of the new houses.

It seems to us that the proposal is unsound in principle, and would be unfair in operation, and even, if limited, as suggested by some of our colleagues, to the case of persons actually dishoused would fail to confer any lasting advantage on those who were intended to be benefited.

(signed) *E. Bond.*
Lamington.
Wenlock.

INDEX.

[*N.B.*—In this Index the figures following the names of the Witnesses, and those in the Digest of Evidence of each Witness, refer to the Questions in the Evidence; the Figures following *App.* refer to the Pages in the Appendix; and the Numerals following *Rep.* to the Pages in the Report].

A.

ABBEY STREET SITE (SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY CO.). Explanation as regards the Abbey Street site of the South Eastern Company that it was obtained by voluntary purchase, the Home Office having no jurisdiction in the matter, *Byrne* 523*–529.

AREA (RE-HOUSING):

Extension of the term "local area" as representing a metropolitan borough instead of a parish, *Troup* 20. 89–93——Opinion as to the expediency of some elasticity in the definition of the term "area" at the instance of the Home Office, *ib.* 221–224.

Grounds for the contention of the Home Secretary that rehousing applies to persons who work more than a mile away from the scene of the displacement; discretion exercised by him on this point according to the circumstances of each case, *Byrne* 298–303——Instances of approval of sites in outside districts, under certain circumstances and conditions, *ib.* 593–597——Statement as to the Housing Act intending that people not working within one mile of the houses taken should not be considered in the number to be replaced, *ib.* 395–397.

Approval of some amendment as regards "area," though witness has no strong opinion on this point, *Troup* 651, 652——Impression that no difficulty has arisen through the jurisdiction of the Home Office not extending to areas outside London; increased jurisdiction of the Local Government Board, *ib.* 659–665.

Difficulty in suggesting any better definition of the area of rehousing, though the term "parish" is not satisfactory, *Kershaw* 994, 995. 1023–1027——Regulation since 1885 as to an area of one mile being the limit within which new dwellings are to be provided, *Gray* 1127–1131——Great advantage and economy if it were not compulsory to rehouse in congested districts close to the old dwellings removed, witness suggesting that it should be optional to rebuild in the suburbs so long as equivalent accommodation is provided, *Robinson* 1164, 1165. 1170. 1182–1198. 1226–1235; *Harper* 1704–1706. 1727–1732.

Great and increasing difficulty of obtaining land in Shoreditch for new dwellings so that an extension of the area of rehousing is very important, *Robinson* 1170. 1205–1216——Improvement if the rehousing area were extended to the whole county ef London or to places still further out, *ib.* 1213–1216.

Conclusion as to the necessity of largely increasing the area within which the rehousing may take place, *Stanley* 1371–1375——Objection to the Home Office being required to enforce a rehousing scheme when two clearances involving twenty houses (or more) are carried out in distant parts of the same metropolitan borough, *ib.* 1377–1379. 1477–1480.

Approval of an enlargement of the rehousing area, subject to the revision of a central authority, *Beale* 1595–1597——Result of witness' experience that it is seldom necessary to provide new dwellings in or near the area of displacement; exceptional instance cited, *Harper* 1728, 1729——Conclusion that a general provision of new accommodation over the whole of the Metropolis is what is really required, this being best effected through the County Council, *ib.* 1729–1732——Necessity in some cases of provision in the same locality for some at least of those who are displaced, *Walsh* 1805–1835.

Contemplated discretion in the Central Authority as to the area within which the new houses may be provided under a scheme, *Rep.* v.——Probability that in some cases it will be found expedient to erect the new houses at some considerable distance from the houses demolished, and not necessarily within the jurisdiction of the same local authority, *ib.*

See also *Sites. Suburbs.*

Artisans. See *Labouring Classes, etc.*

Report, 1902—*continued.*

B.

Beale, James Samuel. (Digest of his Evidence).—Representation by witness (who is a solicitor of the Railway Companies Association, 1559–1561. 1609.

Grounds for the recommendation that the obligation under the Standing Order to rehouse should take effect prior to the removal of the houses and the displacement of the tenants, but not prior to the acquisition of the property other than the occupier's interest, 1562–1575. 1602–1604.

Strong disapproval of the power assumed by the Home Office of fixing rents in the new dwellings provided in lieu of the old ones; great hardship and injustice thereby to railway companies, whilst the rateable value of the property is unduly diminished, which cannot be to the public interest, 1576–1592. 1602–1606. 1615–1646——Very limited extent to which the persons displaced occupy the new buildings, 1580. 1602–1604. 1615–1627.

Approval of an enlargement of the rehousing area, subject to the revision of a central authority, 1595–1597——Decided advantage if the whole question of rehousing were dealt by a Public Act, 1598——Assent to the suggestion that the notices as given to the Home Office by promoters should be sent also to the local authority; the approval of the latter should not be required, 1599–1601. 1610–1614——Limited extent to which displacements are due to railway companies, 1607, 1608.

Birmingham. Large provision made by the Birmingham Corporation for people displaced through their water scheme in Wales, *Kershaw* 792–794. 871–874.

Borough Councils (London). See *Local Authorities. London County Council.*

Broad Street Clearances. See *London and North-Western Railway Co.*

Byrne, W. P. (Digest of his Evidence).—Functions of witness, as principal clerk in the Domestic Department of the Home Office, in connection with the enforcement of enactments providing for the rehousing of the working classes when their dwellings are taken by railway and other companies, 278. 281, 282. 285.

Duty of the Secretary of State to see that the strict letter of the law is carried out as regards rehousing accommodation when houses of the working classes in London are taken down either by railway companies or under local Improvement Acts, 285—— Displacement of about 18,000 persons in London by railway and other companies since 1884, about 15,000 having been rehoused, 285, 286. 288, 289. 467–470——Total of about 12,500 displaced by the County Council and other local authorities, under local Improvement Acts, about 11,000 having been rehoused, 286, 287.

Explanations respecting the action of the Home Office when displacements are about to be effected, the precautions insisted upon as regards rehousing having gradually become more strict, 290–303. 306 *et seq.*——Difficulty with railway companies as regards their acquisition of superior interests without demolishing the houses before their rehousing scheme is approved; legal action successfully taken by the Home Office for preventing such acquisition, though permitted in exceptional and urgent cases, 290–292. 387–394 ——Provision now required to be made, not only for the persons displaced, but for those who are resident on the new site intended for rehousing, 292, 293.

Statement explanatory of three legal questions which arise in the verification of the schedule of houses to be acquired and of the number of persons to be displaced, 293–203 ——Definition of "artisans" as meaning persons earning on the average less than 30*s.* a week, 293–298——Grounds for the contention of the Secretary of State that rehousing applies to persons who work more than a mile away from the scene of the displacement; discretion exercised by him on this point according to the circumstances of each case, 298–303.

Decision of the Secretary of State after receiving the report of the Surveyor (Mr. Steward), whether a rehousing scheme is really required; exceptional instances of schemes being dispensed with, 306–316——Particulars respecting the case of the Tower Bridge Southern Approach as one in which the Secretary did not call for a scheme as being unnecessary; accommodation in this case through the Guinness Trust, 307–309. 316. 487–496——General rule that the number to be rehoused shall equal the number to be replaced; practice not to require any increase as regards the former, though this is sometimes allowed, 319–322.

Onerous obligation upon the companies under the model clause as to the time by which the new dwellings shall be ready for occupation; relief given by the Secretary of State, under certain conditions, in connection with this requirement, 323, 323*——Representations made to the Secretary of State as to the great difficulty experienced by the companies in obtaining land or sites for new dwellings; very high prices in some districts,

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Byrne, W. P. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

tricts, 323*. 330–332——Explanations upon the subject of compulsory powers being but rarely obtained in Private Bills for the acquisition of land for rehousing, 328–344. 533–535.

Advantage in new schemes being submitted to the local authority, though it is not necessary that the approval of the latter should be required, 344——Assent given by the Home Office to the schemes being carried out for the companies by the local authority or by an artisans' dwellings company, 344——Power claimed and exercised by the Home Office to control the rents charged in the new dwellings; expediency of this power in the Home Office, though it is limited to a period of twenty-five years, 345 *et seq.*

Dispute between the London and North-Western Company and the Home Office as to the right of the latter to fix the rents, 348–350——Readiness of the Secretary of State to revise the original scheme of rents on sufficient reasons being shown by the companies, 351. 368–377——Particulars respecting a rehousing scheme of the Midland Railway Company in 1892, and the discussions upon the question of raising the rents; decision of the Home Office in 1896 that it was too soon for any revision, 355–365. 450——Reference to increase of wages as a substantial ground of application for an increase of rents, 371, 372.

Concurrence in certain suggestions of Mr. Troup for amendments in the Standing Orders, 379–384——Expediency of close communication between the local authorities of London and the Home Office as to the administration of the Housing Acts; satisfactory co-operation now existing, 379, 380. 458–460——Advantage if railway companies in London were under a continuous obligation by Act of Parliament in respect of every house which they may take from time to time, 381–383. 461–466.

Statement as to the Housing Act intending that people not working within one mile of the houses taken should not be considered in the number to be replaced, 395–397——Consideration of the extent to which working class people are displaced when new dwellings are erected, 398–401. 404, 405.——Explanation to the effect that the Home Office does not insist upon new buildings being of too good a class or too costly; recent instance in the case of some artisans' dwellings taken over by the Great Eastern Company, 426–433.

Provision, recently adopted, for a revision of rents every five years, 437——Non-objection to the County Council being empowered to carry out schemes for railway companies, 438–440——Explanation that the Home Office does not fix any rents in the case of local authorities, 449–452.

Practice in the selection of new sites to consider those who may be displaced thereby as well as the people displaced by clearances of old sites, 453–457——Suggestion as to the companies being required to keep a register of all artisans' dwellings which they acquire in London, 462–466.

Further explanations as to the action of the Home Office in connection with certain schemes of the South Eastern Company; due care taken respecting rehousing accommodation, 487–498——Reference to the changes made in the Standing Orders of 1884–89 as having led to the increased action of the Home Office as regards rehousing, 503, 504——Usefulness of the increased representations by local authorities, 505.

Large and increasing displacement proposal under private Bills, though not nearly to the extent of the powers sought for or obtained, as many such Bills are dropped, whilst only a limited number of dwellings are taken under Private Acts, as compared with Railway Acts, 506–519.

Doubt as to any necessity for extending beyond twenty-five years the period for which new dwellings are allocated to artisans who have been displaced, 520, 521——Exceptional instances of new dwellings not being ready before displacement, 522, 523——Explanation as regards the Abbey Street site of the South Eastern Company, that it was obtained by voluntary purchase, the Home Office having no jurisdiction in the matter, 523*–529.

Difficulty as to suburban housing in respect of the running of cheap workmen's trains not being always feasible, 530–532——Information respecting the action of the London and North-Western Company in connection with certain clearances or proposed clearances in Park Village East, 536–545.

Examination with further reference to the powers and action of the Home Office as to the limitation of rents, witness upholding the jurisdiction claimed in the pending proceedings against the London and North-Western Company, 546–565——Belief as to the limited number of cases in which fewer than twenty houses are taken in following years in order to avoid the obligations under the model clause, 567–569——Concurrence in the view that schemes should be submitted at an early stage to the local authorities, 570–574.

Statement upon the question of the Home Office considering the effect of displacement in relation to the local rates; this has not hitherto been considered, 575–580——Various

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Byrne, W. P. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

reasons by which the Home Office are guided in deciding upon the number of people for whom new accommodation is to be provided, 585–592——Instances of approval of sites in outside districts, under certain circumstances and conditions, 593–597.

Facilities for ascertaining not only the numbers displaced, but the numbers rehoused, 597–599——Doubt as to railway companies obtaining land save under Acts of Parliament, 605——Further explanations as to the basis and data upon which rents are fixed by the Home Office, this duty being a very serious burden upon the Secretary of State; regard not had to the commercial value of the sites, 606–629. 642, 643.

Statement on the subject of congestion in St. Pancras, Bermondsey, and other districts, this matter being dealt with entirely by the sanitary authorities, 630–641——Loyal manner in which the railway companies generally have carried out their obligations under the Housing Acts, 644.

[Second Examination.]—Explanation as regards the rents charged in new dwellings that the Home Office does not check them systematically, having reason to believe that the schemes are faithfully carried out; supervision exercised by Mr. Steward, 1034–1036——Further statement as to railway companies and local authorities carrying out the schemes very faithfully, though there have been some exceptions; unavoidable delay in some cases, 1037, 1038——Large scheme of the Surrey Commercial Docks Company, cause of some delay in this case, 1039.

Grounds upon which the Home Office trusts the London County Council and the Borough Councils to charge fairly low rents in new dwellings erected by them in connection with displacement schemes; direct interest of these bodies in the condition of the working classes, apart from any question of profit, 1040–1059——Object of the Home Office, in fixing the rent, to procure good dwellings at a rate below the economic rent, 1059.

C.

Central Authority. Degree of difficulty at present through local authorities not knowing which is the proper central authority to communicate with, *Robinson* 1170–1177. 1247–1253.

View of the Committee that in settling schemes for providing new houses in place of those demolished the Central Authority should exercise a full discretion, *Rep.* v.

See also *Home Office. Local Government Board.*

Cheap Trains. Difficulty as to suburban housing in respect of the running of cheap workmen's trains not being always feasible, *Byrne* 530–532.

See also *Suburban Districts.*

Chisholm, Samuel (Lord Provost of Glasgow). (Digest of his Evidence.)—Strong representations on the part of the Corporation of Glasgow as to the requirements of the model clauses under the Standing Order completely blocking the Corporation in respect of the erection of improved dwellings before old ones occupying the same site are purchased and demolished, 1647 *et seq.*——Non-objection to the Corporation being subject to the obligations of the model clauses as to rehousing in the case of commercial enterprises involving the removal of artisans' dwellings, 1651.

Conclusion that the Corporation should be exempt in future from the model clauses when carrying out improved housing arrangements; instance of the Secretary for Scotland having dispensed with a scheme on the ground that sufficient accommodation was already available, 1653 *et seq.*——Enhanced cost and increased rents if it were known that the Corporation had to purchase new sites before clearing the old ones, 1653. 1673.

Gradual way in which the Corporation would remove unfit dwellings, so as to cause as little inconvenience as possible, 1662–1670. 1681, 1682——Question considered as to the modification which the Corporation would approve in the existing obligations, 1670–1675. 1687–1690.

Action taken by the Corporation in correcting the evil arising from insanitary houses, 1676–1678——Doubt as to the Corporation being prepared to carry out rehousing schemes of railway or other companies, upon payment of the cost by the companies, 1679, 1680——Considerable numbers of people displaced in Glasgow through clearances by companies, 1683–1686.

Class of Building (Rehousing). Explanation in connection with certain minutes of Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Sir Hugh Owen in approval of the provision of new dwellings of a better class than those which are demolished, *Kershaw* 880, 881. 1033——Stipulation of the Local Government Board that new houses of a somewhat similar character to those

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Class of Building (*Rehousing*)—continued.

those taken down shall be provided; choice resting with the owners as to the tenants, provision not being specially made for the people who are displaced, *Kershaw*, 925–931. 934–942.

Recommendation by the Committee that the new houses to be provided be suitable for persons of the labouring class and not too ambitions in character and design, *Rep.* v.

See also *Plans. Rents.*

Collins, Dr. William Job, D.L., J.P. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness, who has been Chairman of the London County Council, is now Chairman of the Working Classes Committee of the Council; limited extent to which he is authorised to represent the Council on the present occasion, 1508–1511.

Explanations in connection with several instances in which the Standing Order as to rehousing appears to have been evaded by railway companies when acquiring houses in the metropolis, 1511–1515——Grounds for the suggestion that the Standing Order should be amended so as to apply to the taking of sites as well as of houses, 1513, 1514——Proposal also that where artisans' houses are acquired by agreement (as well as by Act), the matter should be brought under the operation of the Standing Order, 1514–1516.

Evidence as to the importance of notice of each scheme being sent to the County Council as well as to the Home Office; approval also of notice to the local Borough Council, 1517, 1518. 1521–1524. 1556–1558——Expediency of the local authorities having full powers of checking the statements and returns made by promoters, 1521–1523. 1539–1542.

View of the County Council that when any number of houses, down to single tenements, occupied by the labouring class are removed, they should be placed upon the register and equivalent accommodation should be provided, either by the promoters or upon payment by them through the Council, 1518–1520——Conclusion that the limit as to the Standing Order applying only when twenty houses are taken should be abolished altogether; instance of the unsatisfactory working of this limit, 1518–1523.

Information as to the circumstances under which the County Council undertook to rehouse 1,030 persons displaced by the School Board, the latter paying 10,359*l.* to the Council for taking over their obligations; doubt as to the Gopsall Street displacement having been included in this arrangement, 1524–1527. 1551–1553——Statement on the question of railway and other companies, arranging with the County Council and the Borough Councils for the erection by the latter bodies of new dwellings in lieu of those removed, the companies paying the cost, 1528–1536. 1543——Opinion that the question of rehousing would better be dealt with under a public statute, 1544.

Statistics as to the total displacements in 1900 and 1901, and the proportion of persons in each year for whom rehousing was not compulsory, 1545–1547——Comment upon the action of the School Board in accumulating a default as to rehousing in several consecutive years, 1550.

Congested Districts. Statement on the subject of congestion in St. Pancras, Bermondsey, and other districts, this matter being dealt with entirely by the sanitary authorities, *Byrne* 630–641——Much greater overcrowding abomination in the East End of London than many parts of the country; illustration in Shoreditch, *Robinson* 1166–1168. 1241–1244——Instances of difficulties formerly in Shoreditch and Bermondsey through the local authorities taking small numbers of houses for public objects without having power to rehouse; increased overcrowding thereby, *ib.* 1167, 1168. 1339–1344——Inexpediency of large populations being rehoused and retained in congested districts instead of recreation grounds and open spaces being available for a reduced number, *Stanley* 1371–1373. 1413–1416.

See also *Area. Factories. Shoreditch.*

D.

Delay. Explanation that witness does not bring any charge against the Home Office of being responsible for much unnecessary delay in connection with rehousing schemes, *Stanley* 1458–1466. 1480.

Draft Report (*H.L.*). Draft Report, as proposed by the Chairman of the Committee: adoption thereof subject to some amendments, *Rep.* xix, xx.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

E.

Education Department. Application made by the Board to the Education Department before bringing forward any schemes for new schools; subsequent procedure before a Parliamentary Committee, *Stanley* 1497–1500.

See also *School Board for London.*

Empty Houses. Proposal that where an empty house is taken each room should be reckoned as if it accommodated two persons, *Harper* 1700, 1701.

Evasion. Liability to evasion by breaking up a scheme and taking part of it in one Session and part in the next; suggestion hereon, *Troup* 86–88. 212, 213. 274–276——Exceptional instances of companies taking only nineteen houses in order not to come under the obligations of the short model clause, *ib.* 206–211——Belief as to several instances of evasion having occurred by the acquisition of land and houses by private treaty, *ib.* 231–234.

Doubt as to any evasion through persons being induced by companies to leave the houses before the date fixed for applying the scheme, *Steward* 479–484——Belief as to the limited number of cases in which fewer than twenty houses are taken in following years in order to avoid the obligations under the model clause, *Byrne* 567–569——Experience of the Local Government Board that schemes are faithfully carried out by the promoters without attempt at evasion, *Kershaw* 738–740. 832–840——Doubt as to promoters in the provinces proposing to take only nine houses in order to evade the statutory obligation, *ib.* 979–983.

Reference to some proposals of the N. E. London Railway Company for acquiring artisans' houses in Shoreditch, as showing how the Standing Order might have been evaded by less than twenty houses being taken under separate Bills; satisfactory arrangement eventually, *Robinson* 1166——Conclusion that many evasions are overlooked, as shown by the action necessarily taken by the Shoreditch Borough Council; absence of assistance from the Home Office or the County Council, *ib.* 1217–1223. 1245–1258. 1363–1367.

Great care taken by the Local Government Board in former years to escape the liability to rehouse, on account of the expense and delay; exception taken to any charge of evasion against the Board, *Stanley* 1392–1398. 1426–1432——Publicity given to displacement scheme of the School Board so that they come to the notice of the local authorities, *ib.* 1445–1447. 1468, 1469——Explanations in connection with several instances in which the Standing Order as to rehousing appears to have been evaded by railway companies when acquiring houses in the metropolis, *Collins* 1511–1515.

See also *Great Northern and City Railway Company. London and North-Western Railway Company. Railway Companies. Retrospective Legislation. School Board for London.*

Existing Buildings. Reason for objecting to rehousing in existing buildings, instead of requiring the erection of new ones, *Kershaw* 751–758.

F.

Factories. Question considered whether congestion might not be partly obviated in carrying out railway clearances if factories and those employed in them could be removed into the country; statistics hereon as to the number of factories in London employing more than 100 persons each, and as to the large population represented thereby, *Troup* 164–199.

G.

Glasgow. Strong representations on the part of the Corporation of Glasgow as to the requirements of the model clauses under the Standing Order completely blocking the Corporation in respect of the erection of improved dwellings before old ones occupying the same site are purchased and demolished, *Chisholm* 1647 *et seq.*——Non-objection to the Corporation being subject to the obligations of the model clauses as to rehousing in the case of commercial enterprises involving the removal of artisans' dwellings, *ib* 1651.

Conclusion that the Corporation should be exempt in future from the model clauses when carrying out improved housing arrangements; instances of the Secretary for Scotland

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Glasgow—continued.

Scotland having dispensed with a scheme on the ground that sufficient accommodation was already available, *Chisholm* 1653 *et seq.*——Enhanced cost and increased rents if it were known that the Corporation had to purchase new sites before clearing the old ones, *ib.* 1653. 1673——Gradual way in which the Corporation would remove unfit dwellings, so as to cause as little inconvenience as possible, *ib.* 1662–1670. 1681, 1682.

Considerable numbers of people displaced in Glasgow through clearances by companies, *Chisholm* 1683–1686——Question considered as to the modification which the Corporation would approve in the existing obligations, *ib.* 1670–1675. 1687–1690——Action taken by the Corporation in correcting the evil arising from insanitary houses, *ib.* 1676–1678——Doubt as to the Corporation being prepared to carry out rehousing schemes of railway or other companies upon payment of the cost by the companies, *ib.* 1679, 1680.

Gopsall Street Schools. Particulars respecting the Gopsall Street Schools as having displaced about 350 persons, for none of whom was any provision made by the School Board: removal of about twenty-five houses in this case, *Robinson* 1143–1151. 1362——Question considered whether there was any obligation upon the School Board to provide new dwellings; reluctance of the Borough Council to cause any increase of the school rate for this purpose, *ib.* 1146, 1147. 1245, 1246. 1285–1306.

Statement as regards the Gopsall Street schools that the number of persons displaced were included in the total of 1,030 subsequently rehoused by the Board through the County Council, *Stanley* 1407–1412. 1448–1457.

Gray, A. (Digest of his Evidence.)—As Counsel to the Lord Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords, witness explains the procedure as regards model clauses and the amendment of the Standing Orders as regards schemes for the housing of the labouring classes, 1060 *et seq.*

Reference to the Model Bill, re-edited by witness at the close of every Session, as containing all the clauses and amendments which have been introduced, and as showing the precedents which have been established, 1063–1066——Explanation of the difference between the Model Bill clause and the Standing Order of 1902 as regards the labouring class and the provision of a scheme on the subject of rehousing and the number of persons to be provided for, 1067 *et seq.*

Grounds for the conclusion that it has been the intention of the Standing Order from the first that those to be rehoused were those who were actually displaced; great difficulty on this point, 1069–1079. 1108–1112. 1120–1124. 1131——Statement as to only a small proportion of those who are displaced becoming occupants of the new dwellings provided for them; somewhat better class who really occupy them, 1071–1077. 1079. 1109–1112. 1120–1124.

Views of witness in favour of redrafting the model clauses, as being unsatisfactory in many ways, whilst the Standing Order should also be amended; that is, if it be the policy to merely provide accommodation in lieu of that which has been taken away, 1078–1083. 1091–1098. 1112——Advocacy, however, of a separate Public Act upon the rehousing question, which might deal with the difficulties and possible evasions under the present Private Bill system; suggestions hereon as to the modified model clauses to be embodied in a Public Act, 1084–1090. 1099–1108. 1113–1119.

Doubt upon the question of the Home Office having power to fix the rents; suggestion hereon as to this being made clear in the Standing Order, 1125, 1126. 1132–1136——Regulation since 1885 as to an area of one mile being the limit within which new dwellings are to be provided, 1127–1131.

Great Northern and City Railway. Particulars respecting a case of evasion on the part of the Great Northern and City Railway Company in connection with the acquisition of some land and houses in Poole Street, Hoxton, whence about 150 persons of the artisan class were ejected, without any new dwellings having been provided, *Robinson* 1157. 1202–1249——Action taken in the foregoing case by the Borough Council, the company contributing 1,000*l.* towards rehousing in the suburbs; much heavier cost if they were within the stipulations of the Standing Order, *ib.* 1157–1161. 1202–1204. 1249.

Guinness Trust. Explanation as to the Guinness Trust Buildings at Shaw's Field having been approved for a temporary rehousng scheme in the case of the South Eastern Company, *Steward* 485, 486.

H.

Harper, Edgar Josiah. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Representation by witness of the Parliamentary Committee of the London County Council, 1691–1693.

Suggestion

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Harper, Edgar Josiah. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Suggestion as regards Tube Railway Bills that the schedules should show not only the property but the easements proposed to be acquired compulsorily, 1694, 1695——Advantage if the return sent by promoters to the Home Secretary showing the dwellings proposed to be taken and the number of persons displaced were sent at the same time to the County Council so as to allow sufficient time for investigation, 1696–1699. 1736–1739——Proposal that where an empty house is taken each room should be reckoned as if it accommodated two persons, 1700, 1701.

Evidence in favour of promoters making a money payment to the County Council for carrying out rehousing, instead of doing the work themselves; uniformity and economy thereby, whilst there is already a regular staff for the provision of new dwellings, 1702–1713. 1727, 1728. 1730–1732. 1740 *et seq.*——Great advantage and economy if it were not compulsory to rehouse in congested districts close to the old dwellings removed, witness suggesting that it should be optional to rebuild in the suburbs so long as equivalent accommodation is provided, 1704–1706. 1727–1732.

Comparative unfitness of railway companies for the work of rehousing, 1706. 1725, 1726. 1742, 1743——Contemplated provision of blocks of new buildings by the County Council so as to meet numerous small displacements, not only by companies, but by private persons, 1706——Much better facilities and much greater experience of the County Council than of the Borough Councils for the erection of new dwellings; approval, however, of the latter bodies helping in the work, 1707–1713. 1744–1767. 1782, 1783——Instance in Shoreditch of the provision of new dwellings by a Borough Council, 1709–1713. 1758–1762.

Obligation taken upon themselves by the County Council in 1898 to provide equivalent accommodation for all persons displaced by their improvements, 1714, 1715. 1723, 1724——Grounds for statement that under the existing Standing Orders considerable numbers of people could have been displaced in recent years without any liability for their rehousing, 1717–1722. 1733–1735. 1784–1789——Obstacles to the action of the Council through the necessity of schemes not involving a charge upon the ratepayers; advantage on this score if there were contributions from railway companies to this, 1727, 1728.

Result of witness' experience that it is seldom necessary to provide new dwellings in or near the area of displacement; exceptional instances cited, 1728, 1729——Conclusion that a general provision of new accommodation over the whole of the Metropolis is what is really required; great saving if this work were in the hands of the County Council, 1729–1732. 1768–1774——Expediency of providing against such an evasion as that in the case of Broad Street, 1733–1735——Large displacements, not only by Private Bill promoters, but by private purchases, 1735. 1775–1781.

Hither Green. Provision in the South Eastern Company's Act of 1890 as regards rehousing in another district the people displaced at Hither Green; approval of the scheme by the Home Office, *Troup,* 156–163.

Home Office. Outline of the duties of witness as head of the Parliamentary and Industrial Department of the Home Office; function of the Department to see that Private Bills which contain clauses for the taking of land in London make due provision for the housing of the working classes, *Troup,* 1–5——Explanation that witness is not authorised to make any suggestions on the part of the Home Office, *ib.* 128——Inability of the Home Office to entirely dispense with rehousing, though the numbers may be modified, *ib.* 255–260.

Functions of witness, as principal clerk in the Domestic Department of the Home Office, in connection with the enforcement of enactments providing for the rehousing of the working classes when their dwellings are taken by railway and other companies, *Byrne* 278. 281, 282. 285——Duty of the Secretary of State to see that the strict letter of the law is carried out as regards rehousing accommodation when houses of the working classes in London are taken down either by railway companies or under Local Improvement Acts, *ib.* 285.

Explanations respecting the action of the Home Office when displacements are about to be effected, the precautions insisted upon as regards rehousing having gradually become more strict, *Byrne* 290–303. 306 *et seq.*——Decision of the Secretary of State, after receiving the report of the Surveyor (Mr. Steward), whether a rehousing scheme is really required; exceptional instances of schemes being dispensed with, *ib.* 306–316——Belief that in only one instance in the last six years has a scheme of rehousing been dispensed with where more than twenty houses have been taken, *ib.* 316–318.

Explanation to the effect that the Home Office does not insist upon new buildings being of too good a class or too costly; recent instance in the case of some artizans' dwellings taken over by the Great Eastern Company, *Byrne* 426–433——Approval generally of more discretion in the Home Office upon the question of enforcing rehousing, *Stanley* 1477–1486. 1494–1496.

Conclusion

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Home Office—continued.

Conclusion of the Committee that the Central Authority should exercise a full discretion in settling schemes, *Rep.* v.

Paper explanatory of schemes approved for numbers lower than 200, *App.* 133.

See also *Area. Central Authority. Limitation, etc. Local Authorities. Model Clauses. Rents. Standing Orders.*

House of Lords. Witness explains the procedure of the House of Lords as regards model clauses and the Amendment of the Standing Orders as regards schemes for the housing of the labouring classes, *Gray* 1060 *et seq.*——Reference to the Model Bill, re-edited by witness at the close of every Session, as containing all the clauses and amendments which have been introduced, and as showing the precedents which have been established, *ib.* 1063–1066.

Hull. Unfavourable experience at Hull of the working of the Standing Order and Model Clause as to clearances and rehousing; that is, mainly through the obligation to provide new dwellings whether they are required or not, *Laverack,* 1841–1847. 1867–1874. 1880–1890. 1895–1897. 1903–1906——Conflict with the Local Government Board upon the question of the new accommodation to be provided by the Corporation; explanation hereon as to the large amount of working class accommodation already available, *ib.* 1845. 1880–1890. 1903–1906.

Statement showing the large capital cost of land and buildings in one of the rebuilding schemes carried out at Hull; small return from rents after payment of outgoings, *Laverack* 1867–1871. 1891–1902.——Much smaller cost of the land required under a scheme carried out in the suburbs; rents charged in this case, *ib.* 1871–1874——Statement as to those displaced at Hull not making any use of the new buildings provided in lieu of the old ones, *ib.* 1895–1897.

I.

Improvement Schemes. Total of about 12,500 persons displaced in London by the County Council and other local authorities, under Local Improvement Acts, since 1884, about 11,000 having been rehoused, *Byrne* 286, 287——Practice of the Local Government Board as to requiring a scheme when local authorities apply for the Board's sanction of a loan; that is, if ten or more houses are proposed to be taken for any improvement, *Kershaw,* 687–690.

Representation as to the exorbitant price which the Corporation of Hull has to pay for insanitary property when required for the purpose of an improvement; amendment suggested on this score in the case of the London County Council Improvement Act, 1900, *Laverack* 1848–1856. 1868–1870——Recommendation that the term for the repayment of improvement loans should be much longer than at present, *ib.* 1865–1867.

Grounds for the contention that local authorities should be entirely free from rehousing obligation when improvement and sanitary schemes are being undertaken; power under the Housing Act to provide workmen's dwellings, *Laverack* 1875–1880. 1898, 1899.

Particulars of rehousing and improvement schemes submitted to the Home Office under Local Acts, *App.* 142–147.

See also *Local Authorities. London County Council. Rents.*

Ireland. Official intimation from Mr. J. J. Taylor to the Committee that it was not desired on the part of the Lord Lieutenant to make any suggestion as regards Ireland, *App.* 140; *Rep.* v——Conclusion of the Committee that the recommendations made for places outside London are, with the necessary alterations, suitable for Ireland, *Rep.* v.

K.

Kershaw, Noel T. (Digest of his Evidence.)—As Assistant Secretary to the Local Government Board, witness explains the jurisdiction exercised by the Board and the detailed procedure when ten or more houses of the working classes are taken outside the Metropolis under schemes promoted by railway or other companies or by local authorities, 684 *et seq.*

Practice of the Board as to requiring a scheme when local authorities apply for the Board's sanction of a loan; that is, if ten or more houses are proposed to be taken for any improvement, 687–690——Exceptional instances of the Board not being informed by companies or local authorities that they intend to take ten or more houses, non-compliance with the law being very infrequent outside London, 690–693.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Kershaw, Noel T. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Various particulars required from companies when artisans' houses are proposed to be taken, an Inspector being subsequently sent to investigate the houses, the new site, and the proposed arrangements generally under the scheme of the promoters, 694 *et seq.* ——Information respecting the local inquiry held by the Inspector and the opportunities given for objections by anyone interested; attendance, as a rule, of some of the tenants and of the local authority, 696–715——Careful consideration given at the Board to the Report and recommendations of the Inspector, 716, 717——Form of scheme submitted, and explanations in connection therewith, 718–721.

Explanation that the Board does not now take any part in fixing the rents in the new dwellings; no complaints are received on this subject, 722–726——Conclusion that only very few of those who are displaced occupy the new dwellings, 726–731, 752, 753 ——Arrangement for a careful inspection of each scheme after its completion, 732, 733 ——Bond taken from promoters (except from local authorities) for the due carrying out of each scheme, 734, 735. 1009–1012.

Provision that the new houses shall be erected before the old ones are demolished; exceptional cases in which this rule is not insisted upon, 736, 737——Experience of the Board that schemes are faithfully carried out by the promoters without attempt at evasion, 738–740. 832–840——Very general rule on the part of railway companies to carry out their obligations faithfully; misapprehension recently on the part of a company in taking more than ten houses without arranging for a scheme, 741–749. 832–840.

Summary of considerations by which the Board is guided in calculating the number of persons to be rehoused, 750, 751——Reason for objecting to rehousing in existing buildings, instead of requiring the erection of new ones, 754–758——Doubt as to any advantage in schemes being submitted to the local authority for their approval, 760.

Suggestion as regards Standing Order 38 that in describing the houses to be taken the postal address should be given, 761–768——Proposition that the schemes might be based upon the number of people to be displaced, instead of upon a minimum of ten houses, the latter varying greatly in the number of occupants, 769–780——Grounds for suggesting that the number of houses or the number of people required under any scheme should be less in a rural district than in an urban district, 776–781. 785–794.

Proposal as to the Working Class Statement and Plan being deposited at an early period with the local authority, 781–783. 847–849——Large provision made by the Birmingham Corporation for people displaced through their water scheme in Wales, 792–794. 871–874——Difference between Standing Order 183A and the Model Clause as to the accommodation to be provided for those who are displaced, 795–808.

Limited extent to which the Board make suggestions as to the accommodation in new houses; instance as regards a fuel store, 810–812——Considerable embarrassment in a case of compulsory rehousing under a scheme of the London County Council for Ann Street, Poplar, under the Artizans' Dwellings Act; two-fold jurisdiction involved, 813–831. 841.

Payment by the promoters of the expenses of the Inspectors who hold the inquiries, 842——Adoption, as a general rule, of the views of the local authorities at inquiries, 843, 844——Examination adverse to schemes outside London being dealt with entirely by the local authority, and to the action of the Central Board being discontinued as regards the provision of new dwellings for the people who are displaced, 843–870——Dissent from the view that in all cases the rehousing question cannot (as at Birmingham) be left to private enterprise and the law of supply and demand, 857–870.

Conclusion as to many of those displaced not caring to go into the new dwellings, the option of doing so being doubtless well known to them, 875–880——Explanation in connection with certain Minutes of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre and Sir Hugh Owen in approval of the provision of new dwellings of a better class than those which are demolished, 880, 881. 1033.

Examination with further reference to the means to be adopted in basing schemes upon the number of people displaced instead of upon the number of houses taken; advantages further claimed for this alteration, 882–898. 984–993——Further evidence also upon the question of the Board taking part in the fixing and the supervision of rents outside London, as is done by the Home Office in the Metropolis: several reasons for objecting to this duty being thrown upon the Board, the work being, moreover, quite impracticable, 899 *et seq.*; 1028–1030.

Statement as to the Model Clause not requiring that the actual people who are displaced are to be rehoused, though this is provided by the Standing Order, 923–925——Stipulation of the Board that new houses of a somewhat similar character to those taken down shall be provided; choice resting with the owners as to the tenants, provision not being specially made for the people who are displaced, 925–931. 934–942.

Doubt

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Kershaw, Noel T. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Doubt as to promoters in the provinces proposing to take only nine houses in order to evade the statutory obligation, 979-983——Difficulty in suggesting any better definition of the area of rehousing, though the term "parish" is not satisfactory, 994, 995. 1023-1027——Approval of the present definition "labouring classes" as comprising all persons who are artisans, 996-1002.

Absence of any real difficulty through the jurisdiction of witness's Board as regards the country generally, whilst the Home Office exercises jurisdiction in London, 1005-1008——Non-objection to a railway company providing new dwellings through an Artisans' Dwellings Company, or through the local authority, 1013-1018——Disapproval of a right of veto or of control in the local authority as regards rehousing obligation, 1019-1022.

L.

Labouring Classes (*Artisans*). Satisfaction with the definition of the expression "labouring classes," *Troup* 216-219; *Robinson* 1336-1338——Definition of "artisans" as meaning persons earning on the average less than thirty shillings a week, *Byrne* 293-298——Approval of the present definition "labouring classes" as comprising all persons who are artisans, *Kershaw* 996-1002.

Belief that at the end of twenty-five years the companies may use the new dwellings for any purpose they please, other than for artisans, *Steward* 386——Doubt as to any necessity for extending beyond twenty-five years the period for which new dwellings are allocated to artisans who have been displaced, *Byrne* 520, 521.

Proposed amendments of Standing Orders as regards Labouring Class Houses, *Rep.*, xvii, xviii.

See also *Numbers Displaced and Rehoused.*

Large Displacements. Argument that large and sudden displacements cause the chief mischief as regards rehousing and overcrowding, and that small displacements by the removal of a few houses in successive years are not a grievance requiring legislative restrictions, *Stanley* 1376. 1399-1406.

Laverack, Edwin. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness, who is Town Clerk of Hull, represents the Association of Municipal Corporations, 1840, 1841.

Unfavourable experience at Hull of the working of the Standing Order and Model Clause as to clearances and rehousing; that is, mainly through the obligation to provide new dwellings whether they are required or not, 1841-1847. 1867-1874. 1880-1890. 1895-1897. 1903-1906——Conflict with the Local Government Board upon the question of the new accommodation to be provided by the Corporation; explanation hereon as to the large amount of working-class accommodation already available, 1845. 1880-1890. 1903-1906.

Representations as to the exorbitant price which the Corporation has to pay for insanitary property when required for the purpose of an improvement; amendment suggested on this score, as in the case of the London County Council Improvement Act, 1900; 1848-1856. 1868-1870——Suggestion that it might be optional to provide other houses than workmen's dwellings; expediency of facilities to erect some shops, 1857-1864——Recommendation that the term for the repayment of improvement loans should be much longer than at present, 1865-1867.

Statement showing the large capital cost of land and buildings in one of the rebuilding schemes carried out at Hull; small return from rents, after payment of outgoings, 1867-1871. 1891-1902——Much smaller cost of the land required under a scheme carried out in the suburbs; rents charged in this case, 1871-1874.

Grounds for the contention that local authorities should be entirely free from rehousing obligation when improvement and sanitary schemes are being undertaken; power under the Housing Act to provide workmen's dwellings, 1875-1880. 1898, 1899——Statement as to those displaced at Hull not making any use of the new buildings provided in lieu of the old ones, 1895-1897.

Limitation (*Rehousing*).—Question considered whether in London the limit of twenty houses might not be altered or whether a railway company should not be required to replace even if only one house be taken, *Troup* 94-108——Opinion that the limitation of twenty houses might be reduced to ten, *ib.* 648-650——Conclusion that the limit as to the number of houses or sites to be taken in London in Bills in consecutive Sessions should be reduced to ten, as in the country, *Robinson* 1166-1177. 1321-1329.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Limitation (*Rehousing*)—continued.

View of the London County Council that when any number of houses, down to single tenants, occupied by the labouring class are removed, they should be placed upon the register, and equivalent accommodation should be provided either by the promoters or upon payment by them through the Council, *Collins* 1518–1520——Conclusion that the limit as to the Standing Order applying only when twenty houses are taken should be abolished altogether; instance of the unsatisfactory working of this limit, *ib.* 1518–1523——Grounds for the recommendation that there should be no limit as to the number of houses (such as twenty) below which houses might be taken in the metropolitan area without rehousing schemes being necessary, *Walsh* 1796–1798.

Conclusion of the Committee that in London it is desirable that every case in which houses of the labouring classes are proposed to be taken should be notified to the Central Authority, *Rep.* iii.——Full discretion proposed to be given to the Central Authority in settling new schemes, *ib.*

Conclusion of the Committee as to it being sufficient that outside London the attention of the Central Authority should be called to cases in which thirty persons belonging to the labouring class are displaced in one Borough Urban District or Rural Parish, as the case may be, *Rep.* iii.

See also *Area, etc.* *Evasion.*

Local Authorities:

Advantage in new schemes being submitted to the local authority, though it is not necessary that the approval of the latter should be required, *Byrne* 344——Assent given by the Home Office to the schemes being carried out for companies by the local authority or by an artisans' dwellings company, *ib.* 344.

Expediency of close communication between the local authorities of London and the Home Office as to the administration of the Housing Acts; satisfactory co-operation now existing, *Byrne* 379, 380. 458–460——Usefulness of the increased representations by local authorities, *ib.* 505——Concurrence in the view that schemes should be submitted at an early stage to the local authorities, *ib.* 570–574.

Approval of money being paid in some cases to the local authority by railway companies for carrying out rehousing, as in Shoreditch, *Troup* 666–669.

Doubt as to any advantage in schemes, outside London, being submitted to the local authority for their approval, *Kershaw* 760——Examination adverse to schemes outside London being dealt with entirely by the local authority, and to the action of the Central Board being discontinued as regards the provision of new dwellings for the people who are displaced, *ib.* 843–870——Adoption, as a general rule, of the views of the local authorities at Inquiries, *ib.* 843, 844——Disapproval of a right of veto or of control in the local authority as regards rehousing obligation, *ib.* 1019–1022.

Grounds for the recommendation that before schemes in London are approved by the Secretary of State, the provisions should be notified in each case to the local authority; great advantages anticipated, *Robinson* 1170–1177. 1223–1225. 1253–1258.

Expediency of the local authorities having full powers of checking the statements and returns made by promoters, *Collins* 1521–1523. 1539–1542——Statement on the question of railway and other companies arranging with the County Council and the Borough Councils for the erection by the latter bodies of new dwellings in lieu of those removed, the companies paying the cost, *ib.* 1528–1536. 1543.

Assent to the suggestion that the notices as given to the Home Office by promoters should be sent also to the local authority; the approval of the latter should not be required, *Beale* 1599–1601. 1610–1614.

Statement of rehousing schemes approved by the Local Government Board under Acts of local authorities, *App.* 134–139.

Particulars of rehousing schemes submitted to the Home Secretary in pursuance of the requirements of Local Acts, *App.* 142–147.

See also *Glasgow.* *Hull.* *London County Council.*

Local Government Board.

Explanation of the jurisdiction exercised by the Board and the detailed procedure when ten or more houses of the working classes are taken outside the Metropolis under schemes promoted by railway or other companies or by local authorities, *Kershaw* 684 *et seq.* ——Exceptional instances of the Board not being informed by companies or local authorities that they intend to take ten or more houses, non-compliance with the law being very infrequent outside London, *ib.* 690–693.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Local Government Board—continued.

Various particulars required from companies when artisans' houses are proposed to be taken, an Inspector being subsequently sent to investigate the houses, the new site, and the proposed arrangements generally under the scheme of the promoters, *Kershaw* 694 *et seq.*——Information respecting the local Inquiry held by the Inspector and the opportunities given for objections by anyone interested; attendance, as a rule, of some of the tenants and of the local authority, *ib.* 696–715. 759——Careful consideration given at the Board to the Report and recommendations of the Inspector, *ib.* 716, 717.

Form of scheme submitted and explanations in connection therewith, *Kershaw* 718–721——Arrangement for a careful inspection of each scheme after its completion, *ib.* 732–733——Bond taken from promoters (except from local authorities) for the due carrying out of each scheme, *ib.* 734, 735. 1009–1012.

Provision that the new houses shall be erected before the old ones are demolished; exceptional cases in which this rule is not insisted upon, *Kershaw* 736, 737——Payment by the promoters of the expenses of the Inspectors who hold the Inquiries, *ib.* 842——Absence of any real difficulty through the jurisdiction of witness' Board as regards the country generally, whilst the Home Office exercises jurisdiction in London, *ib.* 1005–1008.

Paper handed in by Mr. Kershaw showing the procedure in connection with schemes, *App.* 130.

Statement of rehousing schemes approved by the Board under Local Authorities and Companies Acts, *App.* 134–139.

Conclusion of the Committee that the Central Authority should exercise a full discretion in settling schemes, *Rep.* v.

London County Council:

Non-objection to the County Council being empowered to carry out schemes for railway companies, *Byrne* 438–440——Considerable embarrassment in a case of compulsory rehousing under a scheme of the London County Council for Ann Street, Poplar, under the Artisans' Dwellings Act; two-fold jurisdiction involved, *Kershaw*, 813–831. 841.

Explanation as to the School Board having arranged a rehousing scheme through the County Council paying to the latter about 11,000*l.* for providing dwellings for some 1,030 persons; consent given by the Home Office, *Stanley* 1382–1384. 1387, 1388——Proper business of the School Board to devote its energies to the work of education, witness quite approving of the rehousing being transferred to the County Council and other bodies for a fixed payment per head, *ib.* 1418, 1419.

Evidence as to the importance of notice of each scheme being sent to the County Council as well as to the Home Office; approval also of notice to the local Borough Council, *Collins* 1517, 1518. 1521–1524. 1556–1558——Advantage if the return sent by promoters to the Home Secretary showing the dwellings proposed to be taken and the number of persons displaced were sent at the same time to the County Council, so as to allow sufficient time for investigation, *Harper* 1696–1699. 1736–1739.

Evidence in favour of promoters making a money payment to the County Council for carrying out rehousing instead of doing the work themselves; uniformity and economy thereby, whilst there is already a regular staff for the provision of new buildings, *Harper* 1702–1713. 1727, 1728. 1730–1732. 1740 *et seq.*——Contemplated provision of blocks of new buildings by the County Council so as to meet numerous small displacements not only by companies, but by private persons; great saving thereby, *ib.* 1706. 1729–1732.

Much better facilities and much greater experience of the County Council than of the Borough Councils for the erection of new dwellings; approval, however, of the latter bodies helping in the work, *Harper* 1707–1713. 1744–1767. 1782, 1783——Obligation taken upon themselves by the County Council in 1898 to provide equivalent accommodation for all persons displaced by their improvements, *ib.* 1714, 1715. 1723, 1724.

Conclusion that the County Council should carry out, on payment from the companies, the rehousing schemes entailed by clearances, except that in the immediate district of the clearances the work might be relegated to the Borough Councils, *Walsh* 1799. 1808 *et seq.* 1835–1839.

See also *Limitation, etc.* *School Board for London.*

London and North Western Railway Company. Obstacle to any legal enforcement of rehousing provision by the London and North Western Company in connection with their Broad Street scheme, *Troup* 246–254. 269——Information respecting the action of the London and North Western Company in connection with certain clearances or proposed clearances in Park Village East, *Byrne* 536–545——Further statement respecting

Report, 1902—*continued.*

London and North Western Railway Company—continued.

the Broad Street case, as illustrating a weak point in the present Model Clauses, *Troup* 682, 683.

Explanation in detail respecting the action of the London and North Western Company in acquiring the site of some artisans' dwellings in Broad Street, occupied by about 580 people; alleged evasion on the part of the company until put under pressure by the Home Office to provide new dwellings, *Robinson* 1152, 1153. 1180, 1181. 1202–1204. 1307–1320. 1363–1367.

Expediency of providing against such an evasion as that in the case of Broad Street, *Harper* 1733–1735——Information respecting the Broad Street clearance, the Standing Order as to rehousing having been evaded, greatly to the injury and inconvenience of the people who were displaced, *Walsh* 1793–1796.

Paper explanatory of the case of the company in connection with the legal proceedings taken, *App.* 131, 132.

See also *Manchester.*

M.

Manchester. Scheme for new dwellings for the labouring classes, under the London and North Western Company's Act of 1899; *App.* 129.

Midland Railway Company. Particulars respecting a rehousing scheme of the Midland Railway Company in 1892 and the discussions upon the question of raising the rents; decision of the Home Office in 1896 that it was too soon for any revision, *Byrne* 355–365. 450.

Model Clauses (Standing Orders). Explanations in connection with the various alterations made in the Standing Orders passed in 1884 with special reference to two Model Clauses passed with a view to give effect to the new requirements, *Troup* 13 *et seq.*——Application of the Model Clauses only in cases where at least twenty houses in one local area were taken, *ib.* 17–20. 89–91——Reference to the more important provisions in the long Model Clause adopted in connection with the Standing Orders of 1884 and to the subsequent alterations in this clause for the better protection of the labouring classes as regards rehousing, *ib.* 21 *et seq.*——Approval of the present definition of "house" in both the Model Clauses, *Troup* 81–85. 214, 215.

Onerous obligation upon the companies under the new Model Clause as to the time by which the new dwellings shall be ready for occupation; relief given by the Secretary of State under certain conditions in connection with this requirement, *Byrne* 323, 323*——Conclusion as to the Model Clauses contemplating the possibility of the companies taking land without compulsory powers, *Troup* 676–678——Statement as to the Model Clause not requiring that the actual people who are displaced are to be rehoused, though this is provided by the Standing Order, *Kershaw* 923–925.

Views of witness in favour of redrafting the model clauses, as being unsatisfactory in many ways, whilst the Standing Order should also be amended; that is, if it be the policy to merely provide accommodation in lieu of that which has been taken away, *Gray* 1078–1083. 1091–1098. 1112.

Proposed amendment of model clause by the addition of the words "or vacant sites of houses"; check thereby to evasion of the Standing Order as regards rehousing, *Robinson* 1153–1156. 1168–1170. 1201——Evils resulting from the Home Office not always insisting upon the model clauses being carried out, *ib.* 1247–1252——Approval generally of the present definition of "house" as including a tenement in each case, *ib.* 1331–1335.

Recommendation by the Committee that two new model clauses be substituted for the present model clauses; copies of new clauses as finally adopted, *Rep.* v. ix–xvii——Suggestion that the new model clauses be embodied in a Public General Act of Parliament, *ib.* v.

See also *Glasgow. Hull. Public Acts. Retrospective Legislation. Standing Orders.*

N.

Numbers Displaced and Rehoused:

Grounds for objecting to a proposal that the numbers displaced should be certified by the local authority and taken as correct, *Troup* 132–152——Displacement of about 18,000 persons in London by railway and other companies since 1884, about 15,000 having been rehoused, *Byrne* 285, 286. 288, 289. 467–470——Displacement of 12,500 persons

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Numbers Displaced and Rehoused—continued.

persons under Improvement Acts, 11,000 having been rehoused or provision made for them, *Byrne* 286, 287——Provision now required to be made not only for the persons displaced, but for those who are resident on the new site intended for rehousing, *ib.* 292, 293——Statement explanatory of three legal questions which arise in the verification of the schedule of houses to be acquired, and of the number of persons to be displaced, *ib.* 293–303.

General rule that the number to be rehoused shall equal the number to be replaced; practice not to require any increase as regards the former, though this is sometimes allowed, *Byrne* 319–322——Consideration of the extent to which working class people in London are displaced when new dwellings are erected, *ib.* 398–401. 404, 405.

Functions of witness, as Consulting Surveyor to the Home Office, in connection with the verification of the schedule of houses to be acquired in each case, and of the number of persons to be displaced; very accurate returns made by railway and other companies on the latter point, *Steward* 304–306——Limited extent to which additional working men are displaced when new dwellings are being provided, *ib.* 401–404.

Probability that only a small proportion of the people displaced remove to the new houses provided for them, *Steward* 413. 499–502; *Kershaw* 726–731. 752, 753.

Inquiries made by witness (or his assistants) as to the number of people accommodated in the houses proposed to be taken down, due allowance being made for empty houses, *Steward* 442–444. 471–477.

Various reasons by which the Home Office are guided in deciding upon the number of people for whom new accommodation is to be provided, *Byrne* 585–592——Facilities for ascertaining not only the numbers displaced but the numbers rehoused, *ib.* 597–599.

Summary of considerations by which the Local Government Board is guided in calculating the number of persons to be rehoused under schemes outside London, *Kershaw* 750, 751——Proposition that the schemes might be based upon the number of people to be displaced instead of upon a minimum of ten houses, the latter varying greatly in the number of occupants, *ib.* 769–780.

Conclusion as to many of those displaced, under schemes outside London, not caring to go into the new dwellings, the option of doing so being doubtless well known to them, *Kershaw* 875–880——Examination with further reference to the means to be adopted in basing schemes upon the number of houses taken; advantages further claimed for this alteration, *ib.* 882–898. 984–993.

Statement as to only a small proportion of those who are displaced becoming occupants of the new dwellings provided for them; somewhat better class who really occupy them, *Gray* 1071–1077. 1079. 1109–1112. 1120–1124——Great difficulty in following up the displaced people, and in ascertaining what becomes of them, *Robinson* 1239, 1240.

Conclusion that the people who are displaced are not the same type of persons as those who are rehoused, *Stanley* 1380. 1423; *Beale* 1580. 1602–1604. 1615–1624——Proposition that the basis of rehousing should be the population that could be accommodated under the Public Health Act in the houses taken down, not the actual population there, *Stanley* 1384. 1437–1444. 1481–1483——Statistics as to the total displacements in London in 1900 and 1901, and the proportion of persons in each year for whom rehousing was not compulsory, *Collins* 1545–1547.

See also *Area, etc.* *Improvement Schemes.* *Limitation, etc.* *Railway Companies.*

O.

Occupation (New Dwellings). Care taken that the new houses are fit for occupation before the old ones are allowed to be pulled down, certificate given in each case by the local sanitary authority, *Steward* 328, 329. 333–336——Exceptional instances of new dwellings in London not being ready before displacement, *Byrne* 522, 523——Expediency of its being compulsory to erect new dwellings before displacements, *Robinson* 1345, 1346.

P.

Park Village East. See *London and North-Western Railway Company.*

Plans, etc. Suggestion as regards plans, etc., which are now deposited at the Home Office, being also deposited with the local authority, *Troup* 129–132——Due supervision exercised in London by the Home Office over plans and specifications, but without applying any restriction as to the number of inmates per room, *Steward* 417–426.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Plans, &c.—continued.

Proposal as to the Working Class Statement and Plan being deposited at an early period with the local authority, in places outside London, *Kershaw* 781–783. 847–849——Limited extent to which the Local Government Board make suggestions as to the accommodation in new houses; instance as regards a fuel store, *Kershaw* 810–812.

Police Stations. Doubt as to the Home Office ever taking more than twenty houses for the building of new police stations or County Courts; obligation in such event as to rehousing, *Troup* 645–647.

Private Bills. Large and increasing displacement proposed under private Bills, though not nearly to the extent of the powers sought for or obtained, as many such Bills are dropped; whilst only a limited number of dwellings are taken under Private Acts as compared with Railway Acts, *Byrne* 506–519.

Private Enterprise. Dissent from the view that in all cases the rehousing question cannot (as at Birmingham) be left to private enterprise, and the law of supply and demand, *Kershaw* 857–870——Large displacements not only by Private Bill promoters but by private purchases, *Harper* 1735. 1775–1781.

Public Act. Advocacy of a separate Public Act upon the rehousing question which might deal with the difficulties and possible evasions under the present Private Bill system; suggestion hereon as to the modified model clauses to be embodied in a Public Act, *Gray* 1084–1090. 1099–1108. 1113–1119——Concurrence in the view that the displacement and rehousing question should be dealt with by a Public Act instead of being referred to Standing Orders and model clauses whenever a Private Bill is introduced, *Robinson* 1236–1238; *Collins* 1544; *Beale* 1598.

Recommendation that the two new model clauses, as suggested by the Committee, be embodied in a Public General Act, *Rep.* v.

Public Companies. More considerate treatment as regards rehousing to which School Board and local authorities should be entitled than railway and other companies working for a profit, *Stanley* 1384.

R.

Railway Companies:

Consideration of suggestion that railway companies might rehouse in a new district or in the country those who are displaced, providing cheap trains in some cases to bring the people to their work, *Troup* 153–163——Discretion in the Home Secretary as to the number to be rehoused in cases where a company has acquired land and houses five years previously under the provisions of Sub-section (11), *ib.* 200–205——Liability of a company to a penalty of 500*l.* in every case of a house or site acquired without rehousing; Home Office proceedings now pending against the London and North Western Company on this score, *ib.* 235–245. 261, 262. 269.

Difficulty with railway companies as regards their acquisition of superior interests without demolishing the houses before their rehousing scheme is approved; legal action successfully taken by the Home Office for preventing such acquisition, though permitted in exceptional and urgent cases, *Byrne* 290–292. 384–394——Advantage of railway companies in London were under a continuous obligation by Act of Parliament in respect of every house which they may take from time to time, *ib.* 381–383. 461–466——Doubt as to the companies obtaining land save under Act of Parliament, *ib.* 605——Statement as to railway companies and local authorities carrying out the schemes very faithfully, though there have been some exceptions; unavoidable delay in some cases, *ib.* 644. 1037, 1038

Very general rule on the part of railway companies outside London to carry out their obligations faithfully; misapprehension recently on the part of a company in taking more than ten houses without arranging for a scheme, *Kershaw* 741–749. 832–840——Non-objection to a railway company providing new dwellings through an Artisans' Dwellings Company or through the local authority, *ib.* 1013–1018.

Grounds for the recommendation that the obligation under the Standing Order to rehouse should take effect prior to the removal of the houses and the displacement of the tenants, but not prior to the acquisition of the property other than the occupier's interest, *Beale* 1562–1575. 1602–1604——Limited extent to which displacements in London are due to railway companies, *ib.* 1607, 1608——Comparative unfitness of railway companies for the work of rehousing, *Harper* 1706. 1725, 1726. 1742, 1743; *Walsh* 1799. 1808. 1817.

See also *London and North Western Company. Rents. Rates.*

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Rates. Statement upon the question of the Home Office considering the effect of displacement in relation to the local rates; this has not hitherto been considered, *Byrne* 575–580——Obstacles to the action of the County Council through the necessity of schemes not involving a charge upon the ratepayers; advantage on this score if there were contributions from railway companies and others, *Harper* 1727, 1728——Statement on the subject of the rateable value in any borough being affected by the new buildings erected in an outside area, *Walsh* 1835–1839.

Register (*Artisans' Dwellings*). Suggestion as to the companies being required to keep a register of all artisans' dwellings which they acquire in London, *Byrne* 462–466.

Rents (*New Dwellings*):

Power claimed and exercised by the Home Office to control the rents charged in the new dwellings; expediency of this power in the Home Office, though it is limited to a period of twenty-five years, *Byrne* 345 *et seq.*——Dispute between the London and North Western Company and the Home Office as to the right of the latter to fix the rents, *ib.* 348–350——Readiness of the Secretary of State to revise the original scheme of rents on sufficient reasons being shown by the companies, *ib.* 351. 368–377——Reference to increase of wages as a substantial ground of application for an increase of rents, *ib.* 371, 372.

Explanatory statement as to the basis on which witness advises as to the rents to be fixed in the new dwellings; full consideration given to the old rents paid, *Steward* 406–416. 442–448. 602–604——Recent instances of a reduction of rents proposed to be charged by the Great Eastern Company, *ib.* 434–436——Provision recently adopted for a revision of rents every four years, *Byrne* 437——Explanation that the Home Office does not fix any rents in the case of local authorities, *ib.* 449–452.

Examination with further reference to the powers and action of the Home Office as to the limitation of rents, witness upholding the jurisdiction claimed in the pending proceedings against the London and North Western Company, *Byrne* 546–565——Further explanations as to the basis and data upon which rents are fixed by the Home Office, this duty being a very serious burden upon the Secretary of State; regard not had to the commercial value of the sites, *ib* 606–629. 642, 643.

Explanation that the Local Government Board does not now take any part in fixing the rents in the new dwellings; no complaints are received on this subject, *Kershaw* 722–726. 809——Further evidence upon the question of the Board taking part in the fixing and the supervision of rents outside London, as is done by the Home Office in the Metropolis; several reasons for objecting to this duty being thrown upon the Board, the work being, moreover, quite impracticable, *ib.* 899 *et seq.* 1028–1030.

Explanation as regards the rents charged in new dwellings that the Home Office does not check them systematically, having reason to believe that the schemes are faithfully carried out; supervision exercised through Mr. Steward, *Byrne* 1034–1036——Grounds upon which the Home Office trusts the London County Council and the Borough Councils to charge fairly low rents in new dwellings erected by them in connection with displacement schemes; direct interest of these bodies in the condition of the working classes, apart from any question of profit, *ib.* 1040–1059——Object of the Home Office in fixing the rent to procure good dwellings at a rate below the economic rent, *ib.* 1059.

Doubt upon the question of the Home Office having power to fix the rents; suggestion hereon as to this being made clear in the Standing Order, *Gray* 1125, 1126. 1132–1136——Constant increase of rents in the east of London as a consequence of overcrowding through new buildings not being promised; injurious effect also of immigration, *Robinson* 1242–1244. 1251, 1252. 1259–1266. 1271–1277——Hardship upon railway companies in being limited to an unduly low rent for new dwellings, *ib.* 1347–1352——Equal importance of low rents being fixed in the country as in London, *ib.* 1351–1354.

Strong disapproval of the power assumed by the Home Office of fixing rents in the new dwellings provided in lieu of the old ones; great hardship and injustice thereby to railway companies, whilst the rateable value of the property is unduly diminished, which cannot be to the public interest, *Beale* 1576–1592. 1602–1606. 1615–1646.

Evidence in support of the new rents being fixed by the local authorities, witness submitting that on the score of rent and accommodation County Council dwellings compare favourably with those erected by companies, *Walsh* 1800–1804. 1808–1827——Circumstance of witness not having been aware that rents under rehousing schemes are now fixed by the Home Secretary, *ib.* 1819, 1820.

Recorded dissent of several members of the Committee from the recommendation that the Central Authority be empowered to fix rents, *App.* 148.

Recommendation

Report, 1902—*continued.*

RENTS (NEW DWELLINGS)—continued.

Recommendation by the Committee that in London the Central Authority be empowered to fix all the rents for the new houses, *Rep.* v ——Explanation that the foregoing decision was arrived at by the Committee on a division by six votes to three, *ib.*

Retrospective Legislation. New form of retrospective clause as regards houses and lands, this being Sub-section (11) of the long Model Clause adopted in 1890 at the instance of the Home Office, and altered since that time, the period having been extended from three to five years; modification suggested, *Troup* 34–38. 109–127——Grounds for proposing a further alteration of Sub-section (11) so as to prevent retrospectively any evasion by a railway company in respect of "sites" of houses; cases in point, *ib.* 39–50. 272, 273.

Further difficulty under Sub-section (11) as originally drawn, as regards "any house or any of the lands shown in the deposited plans"; alterations desirable so as to prevent any evasion in the working of this proviso on the part of railway or other companies, *Troup* 50 *et seq.*

See also *School Board of London.*

Robinson, Hugh Mansfield, LL.D. (London). (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness, as Town Clerk of Shoreditch, explains that the Shoreditch Borough Council has had considerable experience of cases of displacement of the working classes and of schemes for their rehousing, 1138 *et seq.*

Statement of the relative population and number of houses in Shoreditch in 1891 and 1901; slight increase since 1891 in the number of persons per house, the total displaced in ten years being about 6,000; 1141, 1142. 1261–1266——Particulars respecting the Gopsall Street Schools as having displaced about 350 persons, for none of whom was any provision made by the School Board; removal of about twenty-five houses in this case, 1143–1151. 1362——Question considered whether there was any obligation upon the School Board to provide new dwellings; reluctance of the Borough Council to cause any increase of the school rate for this purpose, 1146, 1147. 1245, 1246. 1285–1306.

Explanations in detail respecting the action of the London and North Western Company in acquiring the site of some artisans' dwellings in Broad Street, occupied by about 580 people; alleged evasion on the part of the company until put under pressure by the Home Office to provide new dwellings, 1152, 1153. 1180, 1181. 1202–1204. 1307–1320. 1363–1367——Proposed amendment of Model Clause by the addition of the words "or vacant sites of houses"; check thereby to evasion of the Standing Order as regards rehousing, 1153–1156. 1168–1170. 1201.

Particulars respecting a case of evasion on the part of the Great Northern and City Railway Company in connection with the acquisition of some land and houses in Poole Street, Hoxton, whence about 150 persons of the artisan class were ejected, without any new dwellings having been provided, 1157. 1202. 1249——Action taken in the foregoing case by the Borough Council, the company contributing 1,000*l.* towards rehousing in the suburbs; much heavier cost if they were within the stipulations of the Standing Order, 1157–1161. 1202–1204. 1249.

Expense of from 20,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* an acre in acquiring land in Shoreditch; great obstacle thereby to the municipal erection of artisans' dwellings at a low rent as illustrated in the case of the Stonebridge Estate, 1161–1163. 1193–1198. 1205–1208. 1225. 1344——Evidence in favour of rehousing not being limited to the area of the parish, but being extended to suburban districts whence the working classes should have increased facilities for coming to London at more convenient hours by cheap and frequent trains, or by electric tramways or tube lines, 1164, 1165. 1170. 1182–1198. 1226–1235.

Reference to some proposals of the North-East London Railway Company for acquiring artisans' houses in Shoreditch, as showing how the Standing Order might have been evaded by less than twenty houses being taken under separate Bills; satisfactory arrangement eventually, 1166——Conclusion that the limit as to the number of houses or sites to be taken in London in Bills, in consecutive Sessions, should be reduced to ten, as in the country, 1166–1177. 1321–1329——Much greater overcrowding abomination in the East End of London than in any part of the country; illustration in Shoreditch, 1166. 1168. 1241–1244.

Instances of difficulties formerly in Shoreditch and Bermondsey through the local authorities taking small numbers of houses for public objects without having power to rehouse; increased overcrowding thereby, 1167, 1168. 1339–1344——Great and increasing difficulty of obtaining land in Shoreditch for new dwellings, so that the extension of the area of rehousing is very important, 1170. 1205–1216.

Grounds for the recommendation that before schemes are approved by the Secretary of State the provisions should be notified in each case to the local authority; great advantages anticipated, 1170–1177. 1223–1225. 1253–1258——Degree of difficulty at present through

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Robinson, Hugh Mansfield, LL.D. (London). (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

through local authorities not knowing which is the proper control authority to communicate with, 1170–1177. 1247–1253——Expediency of companies not acting through agents in acquiring houses or sites, 1178, 1179——Advantages of the Tottenham scheme of the London County Council; facilities of the people for reaching their place of work, 1198–1200. 1232–1235.

Improvement of the rehousing area were extended to the whole County of London or to places still further out, 1213–1216——Circumstance of the Shoreditch Council being the only Borough Council in London that has laid out a housing scheme, 1217——Conclusion that many evasions are overlooked, as shown by the action necessarily taken by the Shoreditch Borough Council; absence of assistance from the Home Office or the County Council, 1217–1223. 1245–1258. 1363–1367.

Concurrence in the view that the displacement and rehousing question should be dealt with by a Public Act instead of being referred to Standing Orders and Model Clauses whenever a Private Bill is introduced, 1236–1238——Great difficulty in following up the displaced people, and in ascertaining what becomes of them, 1239, 1240——Serious effect of the displacements generally in Shoreditch in increasing the evil of overcrowding, 1241, 1242.

Constant increase of rents as a consequence of overcrowding, through new dwellings not being provided; injurious effect also of immigration, 1242–1244, 1251, 1252. 1259–1266. 1271–1277——Evils resulting from the Home Office not always insisting upon the Model Clauses being carried out, 1247–1252——Summary of the demolitions in Shoreditch from different causes, many of the persons displaced not having been provided for in new dwellings, 1267–1270. 1276, 1277.

Approval generally of the present definition of "house," as including a tenement in each case, 1331–1335——Satisfaction expressed also with the definition of "labouring classes," 1336–1338——Expediency of it being compulsory to erect new dwellings before displacements, 1345, 1346.

Hardship upon railway companies in being limited to an unduly low rent for new dwellings, 1347–1352——Equal importance of low rents being fixed in the country as in London, 1351–1354——Strong objection to local authorities being bound to provide a sinking fund in respect of artisans' dwellings as unduly enhancing the rents necessarily charged, 1355–1361.

Rural Districts. Grounds for suggesting that the number of houses or the number of people required under any scheme should be less in a rural district than in an urban district, *Kershaw* 776–781. 785–794.

S.

School Board for London:

Explanations with reference to the effect of certain Standing Orders as regards the displacement and the rehousing of persons of the labouring class in the Metropolis, *Stanley* 1368 *et seq.*——Witness is not specially authorised to represent the views of the School Board collectively, *ib.* 1370. 1389–1391.

Ex post facto legislation in 1898 by which a liability to rehouse was imposed upon the Board in respect of property previously taken for sites, *Stanley* 1370–1372——Duty of the Board to provide school places as near as possible to the homes of the children; great difficulty on this score in crowded localities, it being most desirable to have good-sized playgrounds, *ib.* 1370, 1371.

Important advantages not only to the children who are to be educated, but to the ratepayers by the acquisition of sites in improved neighbourhoods rather than in slums, better air and larger playgrounds being secured in the former case; difficulty through residential objections, *Stanley* 1371–1375. 1395. 1472–1476. 1501–1507——Large outlay upon a school at Daniel Street, Bethnal Green, a most liberal playground having been provided; much smaller site if there had been at the time an obligation to rehouse, *ib.* 1371, 1372. 1470, 1471. 1494–1496——Exceptional instances of the School Board having been able to secure large sites admitting of very good playgrounds; instance in Lisson Grove, *ib.* 1372–1374.

Argument that the Home Office should not be too strict in compelling the School Board to provide new dwellings sufficient to rehouse all that are to be displaced, *Stanley* 1373, 1374——Inexpediency of pressure being put upon the Board by the Borough Councils to acquire slum property as sites for schools; cases in point, *ib.* 1375, 1376. 1420–1422. 1433–1436——Grounds for the contention that the Board should be allowed to begin the demolition of old houses before the provision of new ones; liability otherwise to great delay in the work of the Board, *ib.* 1380–1382.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

School Board for London—continued.

Further reference to the retrospective clause under which the School Board had to go back for five years in respect of rehousing obligations; arrangement with the Home Office on the score of numbers, *Stanley* 1387, 1388——Strong action taken by the Board in opposition to the retrospective liability thrown upon them in 1898-99; that is, by Parliament, not by the Home Office, *ib.* 1399–1406. 1426–1432.

Further contention that the Board should be allowed to take a few houses here and there over the Metropolis without these being added up, so as to bring the number up to twenty houses, and thus secure rehousing; question hereon as to the views of the Board on this point, *Stanley* 1401–1406. 1457. 1487–1491——Importance in the interests of education, not only of improved artisans' dwellings but of larger sites, better air, and good playgrounds; balance of advantages in the matter, *ib.* 1413–1417. 1423–1425. 1472, 1473. 1494–1496——Exceptional instance of the School Board having repaired old houses instead of demolishing them, *ib.* 1492, 1493.

Suggestion as to Parliamentary Committees, who decide upon Board schemes, recommending the acquisition of such land as will not involve the displacement of people of the working class; that is, in view of the residential opposition now experienced, *Stanley* 1501–1507.

Information as to the circumstances under which the County Council undertook to rehouse 1,030 persons displaced by the School Board, the latter paying 10,359*l.* to the Council for taking over their old obligations; doubt as to the Gopsall Street displacement having been included in this arrangement, *Collins* 1524-1527. 1551–1553——Comment upon the large displacements made for some years by the London School Board without the provision of any new dwellings, *Collins* 1550; *Walsh* 1832.

See also *Gopsall Street Schools. London County Council.*

Statement as to no alterations having been suggested on behalf of Scotland; conclusion that the recommendations of the Committee as regards places outside London are suitable for Scotland, *App.* 141; *Rep.* v.

Memorandum of the practice of the Scottish Office in connection with schemes involving the displacement of labouring classes, *App.* 141.

Shops. Suggestion that it might be optional to provide other houses than workmen's dwellings; expediency of facilities to erect some shops, *Laverack* 1857–1864.

Shoreditch. Explanation that the Shoreditch Borough Council has had considerable experience of cases of displacement of the working classes and of schemes for their rehousing, *Robinson* 1138 *et seq.*——Statement of the relative population and number of houses in Shoreditch in 1891 and 1901; slight increase since 1891 in the number of persons per house, the total displaced in ten years being about 6,000; *ib.* 1141, 1142. 1261–1266——Circumstance of the Shoreditch Council being the only Borough Council in London that has laid out a housing scheme, *ib.* 1217.

Serious effect of the displacements generally in Shoreditch in increasing the evil of overcrowding, *Robinson* 1241, 1242——Summary of the demolitions from different causes, many of the persons displaced not having been provided for in new dwellings, *ib.* 1267–1270. 1276, 1277——Instance in Shoreditch of the provision of new dwellings by a Borough Council, *Harper* 1709–1713. 1758–1762.

Sinking Fund. Strong objection to local authorities being bound to provide a sinking fund in respect of artisans' dwellings as unduly enhancing the rents necessarily charged, *Robinson* 1355–1361.

Sites. Approval of a provision that a company must keep a record of any site that is cleared, *Troup* 263–266——Representations made to the Home Secretary as to the great difficulty experienced by the companies in obtaining land as sites for new dwellings; very high prices in some districts, *Byrne* 323*. 330–332——Difficulties often urged on the part of the companies as to the high price asked for new sites in London, *ib.* 323.

Careful inspection by witness of every proposed site, as well as of the new buildings when completed before reporting to the Home Office; rule to keep the new sites within half a mile of the old if possible, *Steward* 324–329——Explanations upon the subject of compulsory powers being but rarely obtained in Private Bills for the acquisition of land for rehousing, *Byrne* 328–344. 533–535——Practice in the selection of new sites to consider those who may be displaced thereby, as well as the people displaced by clearances of old sites, *ib.* 453–457.

Expense of from 20,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* an acre in acquiring land in Shoreditch; great obstacle thereby to the municipal erection of artisans' dwellings at a low rent, as illustrated in the case of the Stonebridge Estate, *Robinson* 1161–1163. 1193–1198. 1205–1208.

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Sites—continued.

1208. 1225. 1344——Expediency of companies not acting through agents in acquiring houses or sites, *Robinson*, 1178, 1179.

Suggestion that the central or sanctioning authority should favour the acquisition of sites (whether for schools or for municipal improvements) which would displace people who were above the labouring class, and who could easily find their own homes, *Stanley* 1374–1376. 1395——Grounds for the suggestion that the Standing Order should be amended so as to apply to the taking of sites as well as of houses, *Collins* 1513, 1514.

See also *Area, etc.* *Suburbs.*

South Eastern Railway Company. Statement as to the Amendment introduced into the South Eastern Bill of 1889 at the instance of the London County Council making certain provisions retrospective in the event of houses being taken, *Troup* 22–34. 113–123——Further explanations as to the action of the Home Office in connection with certain schemes of the South Eastern Company, due care taken respecting rehousing accommodation, *ib.* 487–498.

See also *Abbey Street Site.* *Hither Green.*

Standing Orders:

Summary of the main requirements in Standing Orders of the House of Commons on the subject of the accommodation and rehousing of the working classes when land is taken in London under Private Acts; reference hereon to the Report of the Royal Commission of 1884 and to the Orders adopted by both Houses on the recommendation of the Commission, *Troup* 3 *et seq.*——Proviso made by Standing Order in 1884 that before the working classes are displaced a scheme for rehousing must be submitted to the Home Secretary for his approval, *ib.* 9——Conclusion as to the expediency of a re-consideration and re-drafting of Sub-section (11), witness contemplating the adoption of an amended Standing Order by the present Committee, *ib.* 272–277.

Concurrence in certain suggestions of Mr. Troup for Amendments in the Standing Orders, *Byrne* 379–384——Reference to the changes made in the Standing Orders of 1884–89 as having led to the increased action of the Home Office as regards rehousing, *ib.* 503, 504——Opinion that the companies are not unduly burdened by the Standing Orders and the Model Clauses, *Troup* 670–673.

Suggestion as regards Standing Order 38 that in describing the houses to be taken the postal address should be given, *Kershaw* 761–768——Difference between Standing Order 183A and the Model Clause as to the accommodation to be provided for those who are displaced, *ib.* 795–808.

Explanation of the difference between the Model Bill Clause and the Standing Order of 1902 as regards the labouring class and the provision of a scheme on the subject of rehousing and the number of persons to be provided for, *Gray* 1067 *et seq.*——Grounds for the conclusion that it has been the intention of the Standing Order from the first that those to be rehoused were those who were actually displaced; great difficulty on this point, *ib.* 1069–1079. 1108–1112. 1120–1124. 1131.

Satisfactory experience of the School Board as to the working of the old Standing Order in respect of the acquisition of sites until it was made more stringent in the Session of 1898–99, there having been no obligation previously upon the Board to rehouse, *Stanley* 1370.

Proposal that where artisans' houses are acquired by agreement (as well as by Act) the matter should be brought under the operation of the Standing Order, *Collins* 1514–1516——Grounds for statement that under the existing Standing Orders considerable numbers of people could have been displaced in recent years without any liability for their rehousing, *Harper* 1717–1722. 1733–1735. 1784–1789.

Recommendation by the Committee for the substitution of three Standing Orders for the present Standing Orders, 38 and 111 (House of Lords), and 38 and 183A (House of Commons), *Rep.* v., xvii, xviii.

See also *Glasgow.* *Hull.* *Model Clauses.* *Public Act.* *Retrospective Legislation.*

Stanley, The Honourable Edward Lyulph. (Digest of his Evidence.)—As Vice-Chairman of the London School Board, witness submits sundry explanations with reference to the effect of certain Standing Orders as regards the displacement and the rehousing of persons of the labouring class in the metropolis, 1368 *et seq.*——He is not specially authorised to represent the views of the School Board collectively, 1370. 1389–1391.

Satisfactory experience of the School Board as to the working of the old Standing Order in respect of the acquisition of sites until it was made more stringent in the Session of

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Stanley, The Honourable Edward Lyulph. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

1898–99, there having been no obligation previously upon the Board to rehouse, 1370——*Ex post facto* legislation in 1898 by which a liability to rehouse was imposed upon the Board in respect of property previously taken for sites, 1370–1372.

Duty of the Board to provide school places as near as possible to the homes of the children; great difficulty on this score in crowded localities, it being most desirable to have good-sized playgrounds, 1370, 1371——Conclusion as to the necessity of largely increasing the area within which the rehousing may take place, 1371–1375——Important advantages not only to the children who are to be educated, but to the ratepayers by the acquisition of sites in improved neighbourhoods rather than in slums, better air and larger playgrounds being secured in the former case; difficulty through residential objections, 1371–1375. 1395. 1472–1476. 1501–1507.

Inexpediency of large populations being rehoused and retained in congested districts instead of recreation ground and open space being available for a reduced number, 1371–1373. 1413–1416——Large outlay upon a school at Daniel Street, Bethnal Green, a most liberal playground having been provided; much smaller site if there had been at the time an obligation to rehouse, 1371, 1372. 1470, 1471. 1494–1496——Exceptional instances of the School Board having been able to secure large sites, admitting of very large playgrounds; instance in Lisson Grove, 1372–1374.

Argument that the Home Office should not be too strict in compelling the School Board to provide new dwellings sufficient to rehouse all that are to be displaced, 1373, 1374——Suggestion that the central or sanctioning authority should favour the acquisition of sites (whether for schools or for municipal improvements) which would displace people who were above the labouring class, and who could easily find their own homes, 1374–1376. 1395.

Inexpediency of pressure being put upon the School Board by the Borough Councils to acquire slum property as sites for schools; cases in point, 1375, 1376. 1420–1422. 1433–1436——Argument that large and sudden displacements cause the chief mischief as regards rehousing and overcrowding, and that small displacements by the removal of a few houses in successive years are not a grievance requiring legislative restrictions, 1376. 1399–1406——Objection to the Home Office being required to enforce a rehousing scheme when two clearances involving twenty houses (or more) are carried out in distant parts of the same metropolitan borough, 1377–1379. 1477–1480.

Grounds for the contention that the School Board should be allowed to begin the demolition of old houses before the provision of new ones; liability otherwise to great delay in the work of the Board, 1380–1382——Statement to the effect that the people who are displaced are not the same type of persons as those who are rehoused, 1380. 1423——Explanation as to the School Board having arranged a rehousing scheme through the County Council, paying to the latter about 11,000*l.* for providing dwellings for some 1,030 persons; consent given by the Home Office, 1382–1384. 1387, 1388.

Proposition that the basis of rehousing should be the population that could be accommodated under the Public Health Act in the houses taken down, not the actual population there, 1384. 1437–1444. 1481–1483——More considerate treatment as regards rehousing to which School Board and local authorities should be entitled than railway and other companies working for a profit, 1384.

Further reference to the retrospective clause under which the School Board had to go back for five years in respect of rehousing obligations; arrangement with the Home Office on the score of numbers, 1387, 1388——Great care taken by the Board in former years to escape the liability to rehouse, on account of the expense and delay; exception taken to any charge of evasion against the Board, 1392–1398. 1426–1432——Strong action taken by the Board in opposition to the retrospective liability thrown upon them in 1898–99; that is, by Parliament, not by the Home Office, 1399–1406. 1426–1432.

Further contention that the Board should be allowed to take a few houses here and there over the Metropolis without these being added up so as to bring the number up to twenty houses and thus secure rehousing; question hereon as to the views of the Board on this point, 1401–1406. 1457. 1487–1491——Statement as regards the Gopsall Street Schools that the number of persons displaced were included in the total of 1,030 subsequently rehoused by the Board through the County Council, 1407–1412. 1448–1457.

Importance, in the interests of education, not only of improved artisans' dwellings but of larger sites, better air, and good playgrounds; balance of advantages in the matter, 1413–1417. 1423–1425. 1472, 1473. 1494–1496——Proper business of the School Board to devote its energies to the work of education, witness quite approving of the rehousing being transferred to the County Council and other bodies for a fixed payment per head, 1418, 1419——Publicity given to displacement schemes of the School Board so that they come to the notice of the local authorities, 1445–1447. 1468, 1469.

Explanation

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Stanley, The Honourable Edward Lyulph. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Explanation that witness does not bring any charge against the Home Office of being responsible for much unnecessary delay, 1458–1466, 1480——Approval generally of more discretion in the Home Office upon the question of enforcing rehousing, 1477–1486 1494–1496——Exceptional instance of the School Board having repaired old houses instead of demolishing them, 1492, 1493.

Application made by the Board to the Education Department before bringing forward any schemes for new schools; subsequent procedure before a Parliamentary Committee, 1497–1500——Suggestion as to Parliamentary Committees, who decide upon Board schemes, recommending the acquisition of such land as will not involve the displacement of people of the working class; that is, in view of the residential opposition now experienced, 1501–1507.

Steward, H. F. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Functions of witness, as Consulting Surveyor to the Home Office, in connection with the Standing Orders relating to the rehousing of the working classes, 279, 280. 283, 284.

Explanations as to the action of witness in connection with the verification of the schedule of houses to be acquired in each case and of the number of persons to be displaced; very accurate returns made by railway and other companies on the latter point, 304–306——Belief that in only one instance in the last six years has a scheme of rehousing been dispensed with where more than twenty houses have been taken, 316–318——Difficulties often urged on the part of the companies as to the high price asked for new sites, 323.

Careful inspection by witness of every proposed site, as well as of the new buildings when completed, before reporting to the Home Office; rule to keep the new sites within half a mile of the old, if possible, 324–329——Care taken that the new houses are fit for occupation before the old ones are allowed to be pulled down; certificate given in each case by the local sanitary authority, 328, 329. 333–336.

Belief that at the end of twenty-five years the companies may use the new dwellings for any purpose they please, 386——Limited extent to which additional working men are displaced where new dwellings are being provided, 401–404.

Explanatory statement as to the basis on which witness advises as to the rents to be fixed on the new dwellings; full consideration given to the old rents paid, 406–416. 442–448. 602–604——Probability that only a small proportion of the people displaced remove to the new houses provided for them, 413. 499–502——Due supervision exercised by the Home Office over plans and specifications, but without applying any restriction as to the number of inmates per room, 417–426——Recent instance of a reduction of rents proposed to be charged by the Great Eestern Company, 434–436.

Inquiries made by witness (or his assistants) as to the number of people accommodated in the houses proposed to be taken down, due allowance being made for empty houses, 442–444. 471–477——Doubt as to any evasion through persons being induced by companies to leave the houses before the date fixed for applying the scheme, 479–484——Explanation as to the Guinness Trust Buildings at Snow's Field having been approved for a temporary rehousing scheme in the case of the South Eastern Company, 485, 486.

Suburbs (London). Consideration of the probable objection on the part of some displaced workmen to live in districts at a distance from their employment, *Troup* 267, 268——Evidence in favour of rehousing not being limited to the area of the parish, but being extended to suburban districts whence the working classes should have increased facilities for coming to London at more convenient hours by cheap and frequent trains or by electric tramways or tube lines, *Robinson* 1164, 1165. 1170. 1182–1198. 1226–1235; *Harper,* 1704–1706. 1727–1732——Suggestions as to rehousing in the suburbs being very desirable in certain cases, increased and cheaper facilities of conveyance to and from the place of work being most important, *Walsh* 1805–1807. 1821–1823. 1828, 1829.

Surrey Commercial Docks Company. Large scheme of the Surrey Commercial Docks Company; cause of some delay in this case, *Byrne* 1039.

T.

Tottenham. Advantages of the Tottenham Scheme of the London County Council: facilities of the people for reaching their place of work, *Robinson* 1198–1200. 1232–1235.

Tower Bridge. Particulars respecting the case of the Tower Bridge Southern Approach as one in which the Home Secretary did not call for a scheme, as being unnecessary; accommodation in this case through the Guinness Trust, *Byrne* 307–309. 316. 487–496.

Troup,

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Troup, C. E., C.B. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Outline of the duties of witness as head of the Parliamentary and Industrial Department of the Home Office; function of the Department to see that Private Bills which contain clauses for the taking of land in London make due provision for the housing of the working classes, 1–5.

Summary of the main requirements in Standing Orders of the House of Lords and House of Commons on the subject of the accommodation and rehousing of the working classes when land is taken in London under Private Acts; reference hereon to the Report of the Royal Commission of 1884 and to the new Orders adopted by both Houses on the recommendation of the Commission, 3 *et seq.*——Proviso made by Standing Order in 1884 that before the working classes are displaced a scheme for rehousing must be submitted to the Home Secretary for his approval, 9.

Explanations in connection with the various alterations made in the Standing Orders passed in 1884, with special reference to two model clauses passed with a view to give effect to the new requirements, 13 *et seq.*——Application of the model clauses only in cases where at least twenty houses in one local area were taken, 17–20——Extension of the term "local area" as representing a Metropolitan borough instead of a parish, 20. 89–93.

Reference to the more important provisions in the long model clause adopted in connection with the Standing Orders of 1884, and to the subsequent alterations in this clause for the better protection of the labouring classes as regards rehousing, 21 *et seq.*——Statement as to the amendment introduced into the South Eastern Railway Bill of 1889 at the instance of the London County Council making certain provisions retrospective in the event of houses being taken, 22-34. 113–123.

New form of retrospective clause as regards houses and lands, this being Sub-section (11) of the long model clause, adopted in 1890 at the instance of the Home Office, and altered since that time, the period having been extended from three to five years; modification suggested, 34–38. 109–127——Grounds for proposing a further alteration of Sub-section (11), so as to prevent, retrospectively, any evasion by a railway company in respect of "sites" of houses; cases in point 39–50. 272, 273.

Further difficulty under Sub-section (11), as originally drawn, as regards "any house or any of the lands shown in the deposited plans"; alterations desirable so as to prevent any evasion in the working of this proviso on the part of railway or other companies, 50 *et seq.*——Amended definition now applied in respect of the expression "house," 81–85——Liability to evasion by breaking up a scheme and taking part of it in one Session and part in the next; suggestion hereon, 86-88. 212, 213. 274–276.

Question considered whether the limit of twenty houses might not be altered, or whether a railway company should not be required to replace even if only one house be taken, 94–108——Explanation that witness is not authorised to make any suggestions on the part of the Home Office, 128——Suggestion as regards plans, etc., which are now deposited at the Home Office being also deposited with the local authority, 129–132.

Grounds for objecting to a proposal that the numbers displaced should be certified by the local authority and taken as correct, 132–152——Consideration of suggestion that railway companies might rehouse in a new district, or in the country, those who are displaced, providing cheap trains in some cases to bring the people to their work, 153–163——Provision in the South Eastern Company's Act of 1890 as regards rehousing in another district the people displaced at Hither Green; approval of this scheme by the Home Office, 156–163.

Question considered whether congestion might not be partly obviated in carrying out railway clearances if factories and those employed in them could be removed into the country; statistics hereon as to the number of factories in London employing more than 100 persons each, and as to the large population represented thereby, 164–199.

Discretion in the Secretary of State as to the number to be rehoused in cases where a company has acquired land and houses five years previously, under the provisions of Sub-section (11), 200–205——Exceptional instances of companies taking only nineteen houses in order not to come under the obligations of the short model clause, 206–211.

Approval of the present definition of "house" in both the model clauses, 214, 215——Satisfaction also with the definition of the expression "labouring classes," 216–219——Opinion as to the expediency of some elasticity in the definition of the term "area," at the instance of the Home Office, 221–224.

Belief as to several instances of evasion having occurred by the acquisition of land and houses by private treaty, 231–234——Liability of a company to a penalty of 500*l.* in every case of a house or site acquired without rehousing; Home Office proceedings now pending against the London and North Western Company on this score, 235–245. 261, 262. 269——Obstacle to any legal enforcement of rehousing provision by the London and North Western Company in connection with their Broad Street scheme, 246–254. 269.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 24 February, 2020

Inability

Report, 1902—*continued.*

Troup, C. E., C.B. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Inability of the Home Office to entirely dispense with rehousing though the numbers may be modified, 255–260——Approval of a provision that a company must keep a record of any site that is cleared, 263–266——Consideration of the probable objection on the part of some displaced workmen to live in districts at a distance from their employment, 267, 268——Conclusion as to the expediency of a reconsideration and redrafting of Sub-section (11), witness contemplating the adoption of an amended Standing Order by the present Committee, 272–277.

[Second Examination.] Doubt as to the Home Office ever taking more than twenty houses for the building of new police stations or county courts; obligation, in such event, as to rehousing, 645–647——Opinion that the limitation of twenty houses might be reduced to ten, 648–650——Approval of some amendment as regards "area," though witness has no strong opinion on this point, 651, 652——Impression that no difficulty has arisen through the jurisdiction of the Home Office not extending to areas outside London; increased jurisdiction of the Local Government Board, 659–665.

Approval of money being paid in some cases to the local authority by railway companies for carrying out rehousing, as in Shoreditch, 666–669——Opinion that the companies are not unduly burdened by the Standing Orders and the model clauses, 670–673——Conclusion as to the model clauses contemplating the possibility of the companies taking land without compulsory powers, 676–678——Further statement respecting the Broad Street case, as illustrating a weak point in the present model clauses, 682, 683.

Tube Railway Bills. Suggestion as regards Tube Railway Bills, that the schedules should show not only the property but the easements proposed to be acquired compulsorily, *Harper* 1694, 1695.

W.

Walsh, James. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Representation by witness of the Workmen's National Housing Council, 1790–1792.

Information respecting the Broad Street clearance, the Standing Order as to rehousing having been evaded greatly to the injury and inconvenience of the people who were displaced, 1793–1796——Grounds for the recommendation that there should be no limit as to the number of houses (such as twenty) below which houses might be taken in the metropolitan area without rehousing schemes being necessary, 1796–1798——Unfitness of railway companies for the work of rehousing, 1799. 1808. 1817.

Conclusion that the County Council should carry out, on payment from the companies, the rehousing schemes entailed by clearances, except that in the immediate district of the clearances the work might be relegated to the Borough Councils, 1799. 1808 *et seq.*; 1835–1839——Evidence in support of the new rents being fixed by the local authority, witness submitting that on the score of rent and accommodation County Council dwellings compare favourably with those erected by companies, 1800–1804. 1808–1827.

Suggestions as to rehousing in the suburbs being very desirable in certain cases, increased and cheaper facilities of conveyance to and from the place of work being most important, 1805–1807. 1821–1823. 1828, 1829——Circumstance of witness not having been aware that rents under rehousing schemes are now fixed by the Home Secretary, 1819, 1820.

Necessity, in some cases, of provision in the same locality for some at least of those who are displaced, 1805–1835——Comment upon the large displacements made for some years by the London School Board without providing any new dwellings, 1832——Statement on the subject of the rateable value in any borough being affected by the new buildings erected in an outside area, 1835–1839.